

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—APRIL, 1890.—No. 58.

THE TRUE AND THE FALSE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL REFORM.

A FEW months ago, there appeared among the editorial articles of the *New York Herald* one in which the writer discusses the question of the most fitting residence for the Pope, in the event of his being driven from the lawful seat of his authority in Rome.

The substance of this essay was then already committed to paper, but the editorial in question furnishes so appropriate a text for our matter that a few sentences are here selected to serve that purpose.

"It is clear that a residence in America would be a serious mistake, amounting, in fact, to a misfortune. The Vatican is conservative in its methods, while public opinion in America is decidedly radical. We have little reverence for the past, and are engaged exclusively with the future. Authority goes for nothing with us, and reverence for it is every year on the decrease. A powerful, an omnipotent individualism pervades the continent, and this strong personality, backed, as it is, by an independence which is fearless and at times reckless, renders the republic an unfit home for an ecclesiastical monarchy. American Catholics are loyal to their Church, but they are apt to concede nothing, unless it squares itself with their own judgment."

That a "powerful, omnipotent individualism pervades this continent," in the sense and to the extent indicated with evident satisfaction by the *Herald*, is, we think, questionable. That all the

evils of our age, and those which threaten the peace of our own dearly-loved country in particular, are the noxious fruits of that pagan philosophy which only needs to be clearly exposed to excite disgust and repudiation in the heart of every true American, we are quite sure; and are equally certain that the fundamental principles of our government are the affirmations of the very opposite philosophy, that of the Catholic Church; and that all the hopes we fondly cherish of realizing our higher ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity are based upon that philosophy, whether in the social, political or religious order.

Despite the warning of an acute observer of popular manners and beliefs that "there is nothing to be expected from descending to philosophic discussions with some generations; to express their injustice, the nursery tale is best"; and, though we are forced to observe that this present age, which boasts so loudly of its spirit of inquiry and freedom of thought, really thinks but little and only echoes the too-often undigested and flippant opinions of the popular press and the lecture-platform, we have no mean estimate of the good sense and vigorous understanding of our people, to which one may, therefore, venture to appeal, with a not unreasonable confidence of obtaining a fair hearing and intelligent judgment.

One must needs descend to grave philosophic discussion in the present instance, for the subject forces us to get down to a calm consideration of fundamental principles, with the purpose in view of solving, if haply we may, the greatest of all questions which must be answered by this present generation—Which of the two philosophies, essentially antagonistic as they are in idea, expression and spirit, now contending for the mastery of human affairs, can be relied upon to furnish a philosophical criterion of that true progress of the human race which is universally sought for, and justly so, under the titles of reform, of social regeneration, of struggles for personal independence and intellectual liberty? Is it the Catholic Church, with its principles of unity and authority and its efforts, based upon a divine altruism, to establish the one and sanction the other; or, is it Individualism, with its principles of disintegration and "increased loss of respect for authority," and its pleas for universal license, the fruit of human egotism? And, on the contrary, which of the twain clearly furnishes principles, and shows in practical results sure indications of progress downwards, of degeneracy, of instability in human affairs, and a consequent abridgment, if not the imperilling, of all man's inalienable rights? Here are two definite questions for the serious attention and reflection of men who are willing to think and are not afraid to face logical conclusions.

We do not propose to discuss the question of the truth of the Catholic religion, either against the denials of the multifarious

sects of Protestantism on the basis of an assumed revelation of divine truth and of divine will in the matter of the eternal destiny of mankind; or as against agnostics, self-styled rationalists and scientists denying the certainty of the existence of God and the need or even the possibility of a revelation. Protestantism, as erroneous Christianity, is fast losing all hold upon the masses, and all its contributions of evidence in proof of the existence of God and of His incarnation in Christ are received by unbelievers as just so much more argument to strengthen the claims of the Catholic Church. Protestantism is only an object of contempt in the eyes of intelligent unbelievers, among whom there is a common consent, as one frequently hears, that, if Christianity be true, the Catholic religion is alone its perfect and reasonable exponent.

It is the rational principles of Catholic philosophy, their deductions and application to human affairs, of which a clear exposition is now, in our humble opinion, more urgently called for than special proofs of the divinity of its religion, both to meet the antagonistic claims of the rationalist and to counteract the influence upon our own people of the dangerous sophistries abounding in all contemporary literature.

We are looking for an affirmation to which no one will take exception, and we think we have found one: "The pressing need of the hour is reform." So say the social and political economists; so say the doctors of law and divinity; so say all the philosophers, even the agnostic. There is no call for a division; for the voice of acclamation arises from the laborer, the mechanic, the tradesman, the physician, the lawyer, the priest and preacher, the grave statesman and witty satirist, the scientist and artist, the learned and ignorant, the rich and the poor, each from his own field of observation and from his own arena of suffering, as he attempts to frame a reply to the urgent demands of human aspirations, or give a response to the piteous appeals for human compassion. And we will add, the hour of pressing need is the hour of the human race which has been long in passing and whose end is not yet sounded. All history, as a narrative of human events, is but a record of reforms, social, scientific, philosophical, political and religious. The standpoint assumed by the historian, from which he views and criticizes the past, is one which to him at least is a real plane of higher elevation than what is occupied by the region he surveys. What appears in greatest prominence, and as subject-matter the most worthy of record, are those events which show mankind struggling to achieve some reform and progressing through reform to what is esteemed as better and truer. All artists know what is meant by the brilliant points and high lights in drawing and painting. Such are the world's reforms. They are the brilliant points, the high

lights, in the historical picture. They are the centres of interest, for the simple reason that what most deeply concerns the man of the present is this or that similar scheme of reform whose realization now enlists his keenest sympathies and absorbs his highest hopes.

But whence does the philosopher of history derive his idea of what is better and truer? Upon what principle does he found his comparison of past reforms or of present progress with other states and efforts of the race? We shall see. Without an idea of equilibrium, *i.e.*, of perfect, universal equalization of opposing forces, no idea of comparative inequality in power would be possible to the intellect.

But there is a very important and bed-rock question which must first of all be answered: Why are men not satisfied with the state of things present to them? How do they come to know, or even to suppose, that the balance of man's intellectual and moral capabilities, manifested especially in the general social result, is not in equilibrial perfection? Why have they never been satisfied in the past with things as they found them? Why is it now received as a self-evident proposition that things are not what they might be? Why would the same proposition have been received as equally self-evident at any period of the world's history? In a word, why is mankind ever announcing the necessity of a reform, and ardently looking for the coming of some inspired or singularly-gifted genius who, as a living personification of the yearned-for progress, shall be to his age a Reformer, a Liberator or a Saviour, proved too often by the rising of some egoistic charlatan after whom the ignorant multitude run with eager and deluded haste to their own bitter disappointment and destruction? The answer to all these questions would appear to be also self-evident. Men cannot be satisfied with what is felt to be a condition lacking in that perfection, the possibility of which they are innately conscious of, as they are as well of a consequent constitutional longing, with an ever-present will, to realize it. This universal consciousness of a possible perfection for humanity is in little distinguished from an inherent natural instinct.

In every order of life man possesses and cherishes in his heart of hearts an ideal of perfection which he sadly acknowledges is not his now, but which, with honest effort and fair play, may yet be realized by the race. No one will venture to dispute the assertion that man always bears within himself a desire of well-being and the consciousness of his own dignity, neither of which can be explained unless he possess an ideal of perfect well-being and of perfect manhood. But, even if he be conscious of a possible future perfection, why should he complain, as he has always done, that

the times as he finds them need mending? Why should the times be, not only unequal to his aspirations, but be judged as often worthy to be satirized and condemned as unjust and untrue, defrauding him of his rights, and, like a convict's ball and chain at his heels, impeding his footsteps in the way of a freer, higher, better and happier life? One would think the common word of mankind should be: So far, so good; well to-day, to-morrow better; Excelsior! Did the monkeys, from whose arboreal abodes we, who have ascended in nature, have descended to live in houses, as the evolutionists would have us believe, complain that their times needed mending, and their tails shortening? Do the unfortunate minority of the monkey-tribe, who have been outstripped in the race for manhood, still chatter in their own fashion for reform and strive to rub off their caudal appendage which, by some unaccountable mistake or oversight in the law of evolution, had to be curtailed instead of developed to make a man of him? Are not the times and tails of monkeys good enough for them? Why are not the times of men good enough for them also? This question is put expressly, and not without reason as will presently appear, for the benefit of those prophets, priests and disciples of the most simon-pure individualism, who believe in the monkey-ancestry of humanity, and must consequently deny to mankind, as will be shown, the ever-present consciousness of an ideal of perfect manhood. These are the philosophers who, it would appear, when they wish to exalt any object, find no other way except by depressing what they do not elevate.

We cannot be made to believe in the dissatisfaction of the monkey, nor in his ever-present yearning for reform of his times or of himself, unless it can be shown that he has or had an idea of unrealized, yet realizable, perfection. Certainly, there is no other way of explaining the universal dissatisfaction of mankind with its present state.

Who told man his times were degenerated? Who tells him so now? Where did he get his idea of perfection possible of attainment? Philosophers, historians and scientists—all agree in asserting that mankind is ever making progress; some say in nature, and all say in acquirements. Why does he care to make progress? How does he know he is not perfect now? Does the fact of actual progress supply a philosophical basis from which the idea of perfection is derived, and inspire discontent at its long delay? Then will we believe that the monkey had an idea of perfection and equally with unhappy man damned his times for being out of joint, and industriously applied himself to get rid of his tail? "Oh, no; only rational creatures can have ideas." Ah! we understand. It was when the monkey had developed into man and became able to

reason and to progress as a man, that the idea of perfection entered his mind. Observation by comparison of actual progress develops the idea of possible perfection. Tell that to the gaping multitude who think not, but no philosopher worthy of the name will listen to you. For, that were to argue from the possible to the real, from the particular to the universal, which cannot be done. That were to argue from individualism, the philosophy of the formal, discrete and conglomerate, to the Catholic system, the philosophy of the real, concrete and organic unity. Perfection is not comprehensible, save as a logical, synthetic, harmonious unity, and progress *in medias res*, being essentially discrete, could never give the idea of perfect unity without the previous idea of the synthetic totality.

Parts are not parts of a whole to the mind unless there is, at least, an ideal conception of the total whole of which they are parts.

So, the human intelligence could never obtain an idea of intellectual or moral perfection, which is the synthetic expression of perfect nature, unless human nature, at some time or other, was in actual possession and observation of it, and thus transmit that idea as a perpetual, natural inheritance to the successors of the race.

Man does not, therefore, aim at reform of his present state, attained through the processes of struggle, and thus make actual progress, because such bits of progress, when compared one with another, give him the idea of future possible perfection, but all his efforts at progress are, in fact, based upon his constitutional desire to reform and reinstate an original perfection, of which he has indeed the idea, and a deeply-rooted one, because he is painfully conscious of its original possession at some period of the race, of which he is an individual expression, both corporally and spiritually, and conscious, as well, that such original perfection is an attribute of mankind which has become vitiated and degenerate.

In vain will the individualist make use of the subterfuge that man, as a rational being, has intelligence of the principles of contradiction, and hence can distinguish more from less, in both the logical and the ethical order, *i.e.*, he knows what is greater from what is less; what is higher from what is lower; what is better from what is not so good; and, therefore, by scientific observation of positive advance to what is comparatively greater, higher and better he deduces the idea of an actual perfection to be attained. But, again, no such idea can be deduced by the principles of individualism. For the idea of perfection, as either a logical or an ethical affirmation, is not the idea of a product by addition or multiplication of being or of quality of being, but rather the idea of harmony from equipoise between the possible or acquired condition of being and its destiny originally inherent in it, answering to the question of: What is its end or final purpose? The equilibrium of a one-

pound weight with another pound is as perfect as that of countless millions of pounds. Now, the imperfection of mankind is due to its state of disequilibrium, which can itself only be affirmed to be such by virtue of the idea of perfect equilibrium, which his original destiny affirms constantly to his soul as necessary to perfect harmony and consequent happiness and peace of body and mind and spirit.

Individualism has no such definite ideal of human perfection, and never pretended to formulate one—a forced confession of its utter inability to offer any criterion for the solution of the enigma of life. But the philosophy of the Church, and it alone, clearly posits such an ideal, by affirming it to be man's perfect equilibrium and harmony with God; and his present state of imperfection is thus plainly seen to be due to a want of this equilibrium, which the pain of discord and his aspirations for that supreme harmony and union with the All-Perfect, once had but now lost, are ever impelling him to re-establish.

No wonder that the peoples whose civilizations were fashioned by this divine philosophy have exhibited among all classes of men a marvellous spirit of social contentment and peace, to whom life was no insoluble enigma to fret the heart out with unsatisfied longings and drive the chartless wayfarer to suicidal madness and despair, for they possessed the master key that opens the mystic doors of both time and eternity: "Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all other things shall be added unto you."

No wonder that the philosophy of individualism, having no ideal of perfection, should have no definite end to offer in the acquisition of science, of material goods, or even of moral virtues; but throws back the soul into the gloomy refuge of an egoistic misanthropy, inspiring only a vague craving and savage lust for more, simply as more. Of its disciples, it was written long ago: "The eye of the covetous is insatiable; he will not be satisfied till he consumes his own soul, drying it up."—(Eccl., xiv., 9.)

The true reformer whose works show a real progress does not, therefore, propose a new theory of existence, the discovery of which he claims as an original invention, as if mankind had never yet known how or why to live. The reformer who is a restorer of perfection goes to work to mend the world as he finds it, correcting aberrations in human life from its ideal equilibrial harmony with truth and right and justice, be it in society, in government, or in religion, by recalling mankind to the contemplation of first principles; not new ones, but principles which are eternal, and in human nature constitutional as the foundation of his sublime destiny.

A most important and undeniable conclusion is evidently deduced from the foregoing considerations. As the history of mankind

evidently shows, and as it is, in fact, little else but the record of reformation by re-affirmation of first principles, and especially of man's original ideal of perfection, human life may be said to have always been in need of mending. And that mending has been the work of the reformer, each in his own age, to bring about the special renewal of society, and effect the needed healing of the nations. Mark what follows. Nothing can need mending that is not broken, and what is broken was once whole, all boastful "honest opinions" to the contrary notwithstanding.

It does not need the theologians to teach mankind that the race is fallen from its original high estate; all history and every man's personal experience gives irrefragable testimony to this truth.

Hence we demand, as logically imperative upon the reason of every man who unites his voice in the common acclamation of assent to the first proposition—The pressing need of the hour is reform—that he also give unqualified assent to the conclusion drawn, that reform (which is, indeed, progress toward perfection) is based upon the idea of an original perfection of man of which some original cause has deprived humanity. From which, as well, follows the indisputable corollary that, as the ever present longing and striving for what ought to be better argues present imperfection through loss of the perfect, that imperfect state and consciousness of liability to fall back, even from an acquired civilization, proves that man is degenerate, and needs, not progress in the sense of our modern demagogues and atheistic philosophers, but regeneration; and that his efforts towards what is indeed progress is due to a perpetually impelling instinct which urges him to re-establish the lost perfection of the race.

So reform is indeed progress, in that the age is bettered by its success; and progress is reform, in that a higher and truer realization of the original perfection of mankind is being achieved. So both ends meet. If man seeks for future progress in perfection, he instinctively argues from the standpoint of a perfection past and lost. He bases his right to demand an improvement upon what he has, and the right to complain justly that things are not what they might be and should be, based on the self-conscious truth of the idea he has of a former excellence of which he is a disinherited heir through somebody's fault, folly, or misfortune, to his great damage and suffering.

We beg the reader to consider well the ground upon which this truth places us. We will find it a point of vantage from which we can discern and measure the whole bearing of the vital questions which this generation, with no little agitation of spirit, is striving to solve. We will find it a point of elevation, a summit amid the varied and lofty heights of human speculation, hidden from many

by the clouds and mists of the prevalent sophistries and skepticism of the day ; an elevation from which we can calmly look forth and clearly survey the wide horizon of human thought and effort within which are displayed the movements of the contending forces, marshalled by the two antagonistic philosophies of the age, to decide the fate of our present disturbed and as yet, it must be confessed, uncertain civilization.

To the intelligent reader it need hardly be said, that the principle which affirms all evolution of human life to be referable for its logical realization to an original creative ideal of perfection being once accepted, one is put in possession of an infallible test which readily solves many of the theories of cosmology and sociology now striving to force themselves into notice.

By the ingenious use of the popular term " Progress," taken in the sense of the individualist as " development by accretion or by fateful evolution," founded upon no ideal, the unthinking multitude have been gradually prepared to accept as worthy of examination, at least, and as even probably true, the pretentious theories of self-styled scientists, who not only deny the unity of the race, but would have us believe that man is only a developed beast ; that the present and past barbarous and tyrannical despotisms, pagan manners and idolatrous religions, are only logical progressions of the race, and that the savage state is a true inchoate, embryonic condition out of which the later civilizations, with all their higher and purer customs and religions, have deduced by a fateful, inexorable process of evolution.

Tested by the light and evidence of the irrefragable principle we have established, viz., that progress is the reform, regeneration and reconstruction of mankind, based upon a primitive and ever regnant ideal of perfection, all such theories are ruled out at once as fallacious by the philosopher, and as despicable by all who love and honor the worth and dignity of the human race.

For he who announces disorder, error, degeneracy, physical, intellectual or moral sickness, by the very fact affirms the prior existence of order, truth, perfection, physical, intellectual and moral health. To assert the contrary, as the philosophy of individualism does, whether in the mouth of the Socialist, the Positivist, the Evolutionist, the Agnostic, or the Transcendentalist, is not only in open contradiction to facts as manifested in the history of the human race, but is plainly irrational and absurd. The existence of God has not been denied or erroneously conceived until it was affirmed in truth. Man does not, nor can, proclaim and denounce himself as a sinner, in that he has permitted or by his fault brought about a state of society which culpably restrains human liberty, and in which the majority of mankind are robbed of just and in-

alienable rights, until he is conscious of a high and perfect estate in comparison with whose perfect elevation of nature he measures his present deplorable and guilty condition.

It cannot be other than senseless for one to assert himself to be in the wrong, if he cannot tell what is the right which he fails to believe or do, and which is both logically and actually prior to his infidelity or unjust deeds. The Socialist, who denies original sin in man, yet accuses society of actual depravity, must confess to the existence of an original perfect society upon which he is obliged to confer the power of free will to deprave itself without man being at all responsible for the act or its consequences. That is absurd, to be sure; but then, no one has the saying more thoroughly by heart than the Socialist: "*Populus vult decipi et decipiatur.*"

By the innate conviction of man's primeval dignity and excellence of nature, confessed by his continual efforts at reform, based, as they evidently are, upon the right to claim all that has been conferred upon humanity, and his willingness to purify by the expiation of personal effort and self-sacrifice the sinful, or, if you will, unfortunate, degeneracy of his age, man is also the constant witness to the two most important fundamental truths which can engage the attention of the philosopher, viz., the unity and solidarity of the race, by virtue of which all past gains, glories, dishonors and sufferings of mankind are reckoned ours by inheritance, and all its future possible fate claimed by anticipation.

We prefer to quote just here the very clear and concise exposition of these principles made by Donoso Cortes, in his remarkable work, "Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism:" "From the dogma of the concentration of human nature in Adam, united to the dogma of the transmission of this same nature to all men, proceeds, as a consequence from its principle, the dogma of the substantial unity of mankind. The human race, being one, ought at the same time to be multiple, in conformity with the law which is the most universal of all laws, and is at the same time both physical and moral, human and divine, and in virtue of which all unity engenders plurality, and all plurality resolves itself into unity.

"Mankind is one by the substance which constitutes it, and it is multiple by the persons who compose it, and therefore it is one and multiple at the same time. In the same manner, each one of the individuals who compose humanity, being distinct from the others by that which constitutes his individuality and blended with others by that which constitutes him an individual of the species, that is to say, by substance, becomes in this way at the same time one and multiple, like the human species.

"As a consequence of both proceeds the dogma according to

which man is subject to a double responsibility—that which is proper to him alone and also that which belongs to him—is common with the rest of men. This responsibility which man shares in common with others is called solidarity. This law of solidarity is so universal that it is manifested in all human associations, and men cannot unite to form a society without falling under the jurisdiction of this inexorable law. Through his ancestors man is in a union of solidarity with past ages; through the successive duration of his own acts and through his descendants he enters into communion with future ages; and, as an individual and a member of domestic society, the solidarity of the family weighs upon him. As a priest or magistrate, he enters upon a communion of rights and duties, of merits and demerits, in common with the magistracy or the priesthood. As a member of a political association, he becomes amenable to the law of national solidarity, and finally, in his character as man, the law of human solidarity reaches him, and, notwithstanding that he is responsible in so many different ways, he preserves his personal responsibility whole and intact, which none other diminishes, restrains or absorbs.

“He may be virtuous, although a member of an offending family; uncorrupted and incorruptible, although belonging to a depraved society; a prevaricator, although a member of an irreproachable magistracy, and a reprobate, although a member of a holy priesthood. Yet this high power, which has been granted to man, of withdrawing from this solidarity by an exercise of his sovereign will, does not in anything alter the principle in virtue of which, in matters in general and without diminution of his liberty, man is what the family is in which he is born, and what the society is where he lives and breathes. Such has been, throughout the duration of historic ages, the universal belief of the world.”—(Pp. 231-5.)

This principle of solidarity, then, which is fundamental in the Church, and may be said to be the principle of cohesion and of continuity both of the race in general and of all particular associations of it, such as the family, the state and the Church, is one which, both logically and practically, the antagonistic philosophy of individualism should deny. Both the individualist and the Catholic philosopher, however, affirm these doctrines of the unity and solidarity of mankind, but they do so in a different manner.

The first, following the Positivist and Socialist teaching, ascribe to humanity as to society a unity which is self-sustaining and possessing a kind of deific existence, worthy of worship, of which men are not the constituent elements and the constitutors, but rather its slaves and instruments. So far as this philosophy holds to the truth of the solidarity of the race in agreeing that all men are subject to a common responsibility both active and passive, it does so

by an absurd process of reasoning backward and downward, deriving this responsibility from the autonomy of a supposed organic humanity and society which cannot be other than mere fictions of the mind, and, true to its egoistic principle, conferring upon them all the attributes of individuality and necessary existence. On this doctrine reposes, as one plainly sees, the whole system of secularism as applied to Church, state, the family, education and all their egoistic, soulless social organizations.

It is not the salvation and liberty of individual man that it affirms and seeks, but the supremacy and odious tyranny of the fictitious unity it presumes to create and set up for adoration. Hence its boasted maxim: "*Salus reipublicæ suprema lex.*" Such a doctrine is standing the pyramid upon its apex, from which nothing but instability in all human affairs can be expected.

If this doctrine of solidarity, in the sense affirmed by the Church, were not true, no man need ask the question which the would-be "omnipotent" philosophy of individualism, conscious of its utter inability to solve the enigma of life, has of late so diabolically thrust upon a generation already shamefully distinguished for suicide: "Is life worth living?" since all would readily agree that it is not. If I inherit nothing from the race but the puny existence of a few miserable hours, to be spent in painful efforts to support life, to solve (?) the problems of science and enjoy life's fleeting and unsatisfying pleasures, of which the more intense in delight are the briefer in duration, and at life's termination lose all hold upon the future, in that I cease to be one of the elements and fruits of human existence, what can possibly avail the cost of life to me, though it were the longest, and, as the world reckons it, the happiest? If, at birth, I do not wake to an inheritance of the merits of the past glories of mankind, or as a new heir to the majesty of its sufferings, what has life to offer me but a shallow goblet of bitter pleasure to be drunk in selfish thirst, then gladly escaping by a welcome death the jealous envy of those who have had less, and the haughty contempt of those who have had more than life has given to me?

But to the instinct and belief of all men it is far otherwise. Any life is deemed worth the living because it neither begins with birth nor ends with death. The unity of human nature is not formal, but real; both because all animal life is vivified by the one unbroken stream of blood uniting the original man through all men who are to be in a common solidarity of physical existence, and also because of the mysterious transmission of the same tri-unal spiritual stream of intelligence, will and affections uniting man's spiritual nature in a common solidarity of intellectual and moral responsibility.

Humanity is, then, no empty-sounding word. It is multiple and

diverse in its manifestations while ever being one and common in communion of life and responsibility. Individuals are thus endowed with the common dignity of the race referable for its exalted character to the divine ideal of it, share its fate, and perpetuate the race in perpetuating themselves and their acts.

Nihil humani a me alienum puto. So say all men, embracing in thought all mankind as both giving to and receiving from him racial honor and sympathy, and bearing with him the obligation to relieve human suffering and expiate human sin. What are the past glories of mankind to me, if they are not mine, by being the glories of *my* race? From whence, besides, could possibly spring up within me the glow of enthusiasm as I scan the proud record of man's past noble achievements, or stir within my heart the impulses of a worthy ambition to have so lived as to deserve well of my kind, if I live not both in the past and in the future? Are the sufferings of mankind in the past as I learn them, in the present as I both know and feel them, and in the future as I foresee them, be they for justice's sake, in the defence of truth and right, or even its sadly-earned woes for its follies and its sins, nothing to me? Then am I not its born image and son, but a miserable abortion, a monster without traceable ancestry, whose living is indeed of no worth to it, and of but counterfeit value to myself.

Upon this indisputable doctrine of solidarity reposes the validity of the charter of all human rights, social, political and religious; since the idea of right is inconceivable if an intercommunion of human responsibility be denied, which again, without the affirmation of a common nature, would be equally inconceivable and absurd.

To it must be referred as well the justice of the universally recognized claims to the glories of an honorable and illustrious ancestry, the principle of national identity, the consecration of the flag, and other symbols of national unity. It is the fountain of the virtue of patriotism. It is implied in every common effort made to lift a brother man out of the ditch, and it gives meaning and more lustre than the eye seeth to the crown of laurels which a grateful people weaves for the brows of its heroes who have gained its victories, or to be laid as a pledge of memory upon the graves of its martyrs who have gone to death for its love. Eliminate the doctrine of the solidarity of humanity, and all those ideas, purposes and sacrifices would be meaningless.

That the true estimate of the worthiness and hopefulness of human life, with all the aspirations, sympathies and union of effort directed to a common end, are justly held to be universal with mankind (whose exceptions are deemed wanting in reason or despised as stupid misanthropes), we are logically led to the conclu-

sion that mankind are naturally Catholic in philosophy, and would be universally so in effect but for the inconsistency born of man's perverse and degenerate will. Partaking of the like mysterious perpetuity of life and communion of glory and suffering with which the race itself is endowed, not only nations and families are thus kept in their own orbital system of harmonious movement, each in its own order working out a special destiny, but individuals as well establish a similar solidarity, within whose circle of common virtue and spiritual power are drawn those who look up to them as the fathers and founders of their states, their civilization or their religion. They are descended from him by the same law of solidarity through spiritual genesis, entering by inheritance of his spirit a new sphere of responsibility. And this is equally true of those wretches who have prostituted their genius in establishing tyrannies of rule and systems of false philosophy and religion, as it is of those who rise upon the horizon of their age as brilliant orbs diffusing life-giving rays of truth and justice, whose aurora is marked by the dawn of new liberty and peace, and whose setting leaves the world that was illumined during their transit renewed and refreshed, with all its fields of human labor already heavy with full harvests of virtue.

These are the men who truly reform their age, and in reforming their age they reform the race.

And if they do so, it is because they will be found to have recalled mankind to the contemplation of its pristine state of perfection by announcing eternal principles of truth, liberty and justice; not principles to be gradually elaborated by progress, but principles that were ever in the right of mankind to claim as a basis of life, because the same idea of perfection was ever his. And because they appear when the times sadly need mending; when the spirit of degeneracy has so enslaved the human mind as to shut out from clear view that original purity and destiny of the race as to lead men to ask, as some do now, if indeed life be worth the living, we find them recalling the despairing nations to new hope by some supreme word of wisdom or deed of supernatural heroism and self-sacrifice, holding up in strong contrast the dignity and inalienable rights of man, the possibilities of bringing their nature up to perfect conformity with its highest ideal, when compared with the present state of decadence and peril of social, civil or religious damnation.

You cannot arouse enthusiasm for reform without first convincing those you wish to reform that they are degenerate. But to do this you must evidently instruct them, or rely upon their possessing a lively consciousness of a former state of perfection of which their present one is a deterioration. Of what use to appeal to the degenerate scions of a royal house to assume the reins of

power and practise the virtues of kings upon the sole plea of progress from their degraded plebeian state to one of sovereignty. They must be told, if they be ignorant, of their illustrious descent, and made to feel that it is a duty to sustain the renown of their noble ancestors. Of what use to breathe the word freedom into the ear of the shackled slave unless you teach him that all men are born of a free and equal nature; that he has been made a slave after and not before birth; that personal liberty is, and always was, the sacred birthright of man, and therefore that his slave-father begat, and his slave-mother bore, and brought him forth into God's world a free man?

What is true of one inborn right of man is true of all, for the ideal of humanity is and ever was "the perfect man." So we again affirm as past all doubt or contradiction that mankind, in reforming itself to what is better, returns to original perfection by re-affirmations in act of its ideal rather than that it advances to the realization and enjoyment of a product by gradual development of human nature, of which his present imperfect condition is embryonic and in process of formation; a truth which at perhaps no time of the world's history it would appear was ever so commonly ignored or openly denied as in our own boastful age of science. That was a bitter satire of the musician Grétry, but it has its application quite as aptly and forcibly now as when it was penned a century ago. *Plus nous deviendrons savans, plus nous nous éloignerons du vrai*—The more scientific we are becoming, the further we are taking ourselves away from truth.

Why do the names of great and true reformers live as saviours or their race or nation? Why does the name of Jesus Christ—*Nomen adorandum in æternum!*—live as the only true, universal Saviour of the world? Because, in their own order and degree, according to the sublimity of their mission to restore and build up again the fallen fortunes of humanity, they presented and enforced certain fundamental truths whose criterion can only be found in man's original supremacy of nature and endowments, and thus established a movement, not of progression to an unknown and baseless perfection to be hoped for through the working out of unintelligent physical laws, but of restoration, of redemption, of regeneration, as the basis of an ever-present, urgent ideal whose spiritual forces irresistibly attract all mankind. This fully explains why man is ever uneasy and discontented with his age and his environments.

Herein lies the secret of all his unbounded aspirations. This is what renews his courage in failure and disaster, gives value to every well-meant effort, and more than repays the heaviest sacri-

fices that his own life, or the lives of his brother-man, may demand of him.

Such men appear at what are clearly seen by later historians to be critical periods in civilization. The vitiated and perhaps fast-corrupting order in society, in government or in religion, is seen to have threatened confusion, revolution and ruin. It was as if the bond which held together the once stable arch of civilization had become disintegrated and broken, and the once harmoniously related stones of the structure had rebelled against each other, refusing to give and yield mutual support, no longer obedient to the law of solidarity which alone can produce unity. Rebellion against unity is ever due to the affirmation of the egoistic principle of individualism; the principle "of man's first disobedience and the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe"; the principle of that arrogant self-worship which hurled the first star of heaven from his orbit of supernal order, and bade him utter his word of defiance. "Better to reign in hell than to serve in heaven." Then, indeed, is it felt to be true that the pressing need of the hour is reform, and it is explained why the inspired saviour of his age always exhibits in both word and action a singularly impatient haste. He knows that the seeds of death are more rapid in their germination than the seeds of life; he knows that the swift and swirling waters of the unrestrained torrent go quickly to the abyss with loud threatenings of death and destruction; but the peaceful stream which irrigates the smiling fields, imparting to them new beauty and fruitfulness, flows but slowly and in majestic silence. Yes; he sees that there is pressing need because he is one of those who rise before the dawn, and during the shadows of the night, when men sleep in fancied security, he has seen the "enemy" a-field sowing broadcast the cockle which will surely choke the good grain ere it can ripen for a harvest. None so quick as he to see the rapid commingling of the thousand and one streams of error and passion into a torrent of ungovernable anarchy, in which society will soon be hopelessly overwhelmed. No wonder he speaks in eloquent haste and with an imprudence of language which scandalizes the slower of heart. No wonder the tones of his voice are marked by the shrill accents of warning and alarm. He is the chosen seer of the hour, and beholds with prophetic glance the impending ruin and corruption threatening his generation. Therefore he who announces and secures the accomplishment of the needed reform is truly a saviour. He saves society; he saves the country; he saves the rights of his fellow-men; he saves the child, the woman, the family; he saves religion; he saves, it may be, the whole human race.

Degeneracy is intellectual and moral death. Reform is revivi-

fication, and he who is the true reformer and saviour brings new life to the world. Now we begin to see what is fully meant by the phrase, "the regeneration of society." No wonder we hear Him who was and is the true Saviour of mankind in all orders, the supreme regenerator of all human relations, use the significant declarations: "Ye must be born again;" "I have not come to destroy the law, or the prophets, but to fulfil." No wonder we hear Him calling men to imitate the perfection even of God. No wonder that this chief affirmation was "Union," as it has always been of the divine philosophy and theology which He promulgated to the world, and, following the law which governs the march and victory of truth, is slowly but surely bringing about that divine "restitution of all things" which he prophesied, and which his first apostle took it for granted men knew of and yearned for,—that restitution having been the "speech of God by the mouth of His holy prophets (reformers) from the beginning of the world."

The reformation of the world inaugurated by Jesus Christ would be more than an incomprehensible enigma, it would be a senseless paradox, but for the truth of the original perfection of mankind, to the restitution of which, by regeneration of all human relations, His reformation called humanity and condemned the spirit from which all degeneracy arises. No less incomprehensible would be the doctrines of perfection as so completely announced and clearly defined by Him unless the principles of solidarity and of racial unity be assumed as their ethical basis. With these unquestionable fundamental principles in view we commend to our sincere reader another perusal of the Gospels and Apostolic Epistles. If, mayhap, we have pointed out to him an untrodden path to the "Mount of Vision," it is not unlikely he will say, as more than one has said who came to their perusal in the light of a true philosophy—"Though I have studied the Scriptures from my youth up, yet I am as he who readeth for the first time."

Reformers are saviours of men, therefore, not in that they inaugurate a new era of progress from nothing to something, but in that they restore and save what is lost by restoring a broken, disintegrated and dissolving condition to unity and harmony; by a re-formation of humanity in its various relations; by a re-affirmation of that divine unity impressed upon the race, and whose preservation is concomitant with its struggle for perfection; and not the proclamation and establishment of a new, factitious unity, a conglomerate aggregation devoid of all vital principle and powers of fecundity; a body lacking, indeed, continuity, as it lacks an original ideal, and therefore impossible of logical definition.

Whence we get a sure criterion of the value of all great movements in the social, civil or religious order which offer themselves

for recognition and assent as evidences of true progress and logical development of the mental, physical and spiritual powers of mankind. True enlargement and advance in any or all of these orders of human life and activity are dynamically centripetal, not centrifugal. They lead to the Catholic affirmation, reconciliation and reconstitution of unity and harmony, and are abhorrent to the negation of it by the teaching of principles which produce multiplicity of antagonistic forces in society, Church and state by the introduction and fostering of the principles of individualism.

It is clearly illustrated on every page of history that degeneracy and disintegration of their autonomy in peoples, in their social relations, in the state and in religion, has ever been signalized by the oblivion of this doctrine of solidarity and consequent denial of equal rights and common responsibility between the governor and the governed, everywhere enjoyed as they were valorously defended when the Church named both their religion and their philosophy. Long before that philosophy, which is essentially adverse to the highest interests of mankind by contrast of principle, justly named individualism, had crystallized into socialism, communism and anarchism in society, into secularism in State and judicial administration, and in education, and into self-destructive sectarianism in religion, it had shown its power to disintegrate humanity, to establish castes and classes full of irreconcilable enmities and jealousies, "producing," as says that eminent writer already quoted, "the bloody and sensual egotism of the ancient pagan nations, transmitting a tradition that certain peoples of the common race were constitutionally cursed and disinherited of all right and quality of virtue, and forever condemned to legitimate and perpetual slavery."

Hardly less degrading was the racial egotism of the Jews, to whom Jesus Christ came as the equal Saviour of all men, and to whom the Catholic Apostle *par excellence*, St. Paul, knew neither barbarian nor Scythian, neither Jew nor Gentile, neither bond nor free. How could either the religion or the philosophy of this God-man or His apostle be anything else but Catholicity? Rome in her imperial despotism, Athens in her insolent and rapacious aristocracy, under the pretence of democracy, and later nations, whether enslaved under a king or a commune, who have equally dared to insult the outraged dignity of man by flinging in the face of Europe the arrogant boast, *l' état c'est moi*, all manifest the like fruits of the same egoistic philosophy. That boastful maxim of the ancients, *salus populi suprema lex*, was but a specious pretext for absorbing the rights of the man in the interest of the nation. It seemed a proud and a glorious thing to say, "I am a Roman citizen." "I am an American citizen" sounds tame in comparison

to it. And yet that Roman citizen was nothing but a political slave, the tool of a pagan Socialism, a sort of State Freemason. He was a citizen; true, but he was not a man. For what was the pagan political doctrine as laid down by the jurisconsults of Rome? Of the subject—*Non licet esse vos*—you have no right to exist. Of the government—*Princeps legibus solutus*—the ruler is bound by no law; or, as the English have translated for themselves, the king can do no wrong.

M. Guizot, no mean philosopher of history, and beyond suspicion of personal bias in favor of Catholicity as a religion, contrasts the influence of the ruling power of the Church with that of Protestantism upon society in the question of popular rights. "After the fall of the Roman Empire and during the Middle Ages it was the Papacy which, in the turmoil of the violent disorders of the times, was the defender and the patron of the rights of the people."—(*L'Église et la Société Chrétienne*, p. 103.) Of Protestantism he says: "Protestants have not known how to reconcile the rights and necessities of tradition with those of liberty, and the cause of it undoubtedly has been that the Reformation did not fully understand and accept either its principles or its effects, whence arises a certain inconsistency and narrowness of spirit."—(*History of Civilization*, Lect. 12.) And of Germany, the school where Protestantism learned both its philosophy and its religion, he says that "far from demanding political liberty, it has accepted, I should not like to say political servitude, but rather the absence of political liberty."

That the philosophy of Protestantism is individualism it were superfluous to prove, for its fundamental principle, the right of private judgment, is perhaps the most extreme application of that philosophy ever made. Its palpable fruits of dissension, disintegration, its vain attempts at union of its sects, and its foremost position in the ranks of those who would achieve the impending ruin of our present civilization by secularizing the family, education, the state, and even religion, all go to prove that its germinal principle is identical with that of the philosophy of individualism.

If ever the Church was called upon to sound the note of alarm, it is now. Many of the wisest and best, albeit in matters of philosophy most ignorant, as well as the designing and the worst, have boldly thrown out the standard of secularization of what is essentially divine in constitution, and whose triumph would be marked by dissolution of the family, abolition of the rights of property, which repose ultimately upon the supremacy of the doctrine of the solidarity of the family (the principles of the perpetuity of both family and property), the weakening, if not the total annihilation, of government by anarchical maxims, and the gradual, as already patent, de-

generacy of national and personal moral virtues resulting from the secularization of education, whose most evident and undeniable product, and one likely to prove the most poisonous and disastrous to the destiny of our civilization, is the prevalent tendency to that Satanic intellectual egotism, under the name of Agnosticism, which, in denying the divine origin of the race, denies its moral responsibility to a Creator, and fears not, even at the price of self-stultification, to deny the very existence of the Creator Himself.

If we ask others from whence arises the present widespread belief, in spite of its glaring violation of justice, that the right of education inheres in the state, the answer that we get, or that they dare to give, is the Socialist maxim: *Salus reipublicæ suprema lex*. If we ask ourselves the cause of this slavish yielding of parental right and base shirking of parental responsibility, we can find it nowhere but in the prevalence of that "omnipotent" individualism in the philosophy of the day which not only logically ought to, but practically does, deny the divine constitution of both family and state, and refers the existence of both to individual human caprice and rule. Denying the law of solidarity as of divine constitution, it denies all basis and reason of responsibility, frets under its restrictions, and eagerly catches at some creature of its own, which it holds the state to be, upon whose body (for soul it has not been able to give it) it can shift the whole burden. No wonder that its schools are soulless and godless. The individualist doctrine of Socialism does not recognize divine authorship in anything, least of all in the state. Its god is its own creation, and all its authority is derived from the individual. The maxim, *vox populi vox Dei*, is theirs in its basest sense.

If we ask our modern jurisconsults why there is such a shameful exhibition of weakness in ruling powers, shown in the difficulty of the conviction of the most notorious criminals, and the widespread delay of judicial decrees in the courts, we get nothing but a miserable excuse in reply, either that political influence is more powerful than law, or that there are not enough courts to dispose of the indictments. If we ask ourselves the reason, we find it again in the popularity of the same atheistic philosophy which would secularize both the judiciary and the state. Shall a thing judge and condemn its own creator? By whose will and idea of justice shall they judge? Through whose strength shall they dare to be strong?

By an unerring and logical instinct both governments and judiciary, becoming more and more the creatures of the individual, at whose beck and call, known as popular opinion, they move as puppets, lose sight of their divine right, and become weak and timorous. Penalties are relaxed and justice is long delayed. Pleas

of insanity and eccentricity are willingly accepted where the sense of the immorality of crime no longer prevails. The force of the traditional ordeal of the oath is less relied upon, or even dispensed with, and replaced by the affirmation of the individual. Secularization of the state and the judiciary must, therefore, be followed by the sight of criminals stalking, with shameless effrontery, the open streets, corrupt officials who defy impeachment, and even murderers, whom the godless courts dare not or care not to imprison or hang.

If we seek in the journals the expression of the public opinion concerning the outgrowth and dangers of the daily multiplication and despotic tyranny of soulless corporations, trusts, and the like evidently godless and irresponsible associations, we find grievous and bitter laments enough over the suffering of the slaves of labor forced to come under the grinding grasp of the heartless capitalists who, taking advantage of modern improvements in machinery, have reduced the once intelligent mechanic to an unintelligent mechanical instrument, thus entirely bereft of the natural happiness arising from being the producer of a whole work, crushing out all individuality and stunting the growth of all natural genius. All this we find, but no explanation of the principle which is thus building up an insolent and omnipotent plutocracy which buys and sells votes of men who call themselves freemen, but goes further and corrupts officials in high places, who, in turn, pass laws and render decrees to serve the ends of their base masters.

What is the cause of this alarming degeneracy, for what else will any one dare to call it? We must look for the cause in its germinal principle, the same one that lies at the root of all degeneracy. It is the same omnipotent and damnable individualism, the satanic philosophy which identifies the attainment of superior scientific knowledge, the possession of more wealth and of more power with essential good, to be sought for their own sake. Who thus seek these things? Those whose rule of life and base ideal of happiness is to enjoy what pleases them, not what *ought* to please. Selfish egotists, for whom the whole world is a prey to be caught and to serve their caprice or diversion as one cages a wild beast; apt pupils in the school of that philosophy which knows no responsibility because, both by its theories and its practice, it denies the divine solidarity of mankind, which alone can establish fraternal relations between man and man, and waken in the breast all those common sympathies, affections, and tender, yet noble, virtues, lacking which society would soon be broken up into hordes of jealous and vindictive savages, whose hand would be against every man without law and without conscience.

Such is individualism. How do you like it, brethren, as a crite-

tion of the perfect civilization you picture to yourselves as the hope of humanity? How think you it will serve as the basis of the much-needed reform you so urgently call for to-day in society, in politics, and, if you will, in religion? Are you quite sure you would like to see the philosophy of individualism wholly omnipotent? If one comes forth announcing himself as a present saviour of his age, will you enlist under his standard, and make yourselves and children his sworn disciples if such be his doctrine? Is it not plainly the doctrine of a destroyer, and not of a saviour, of mankind?

Where, then, shall we find a philosophy which furnishes the doctrine of one who assuredly will be a saviour to our present civilization; which shall render abortive the destructive tendencies of individualism, and moreover affirm principles of conservation of what is good; which will offer the criterion of a true reformation of the present worthy to be called a regeneration of society, and endowed with true generative principles of development and order; will build up a coherent system of thought and life in accordance with the universal consciousness of an appointed perfection of humanity?

There is such a philosophy, and there is but one; the most fitting term for which would indeed be Socialism, were it not that such a term is already identified with doctrines and effort based upon the worst phases of individualism. No other term is left but Catholicity, which indeed it bears. Unlike its antagonistic philosophy, as exhibited in various concrete forms such as Socialism, Communism, Anarchism, or pure humanitarianism, Catholicism is both a religion and (what is not so well known) a complete consistent system of universal philosophy embracing the whole field of human thought and applicable in logical consequence to all human life and condition. The philosophy of its theism, called theology, the philosophy of its faith, is not in any sense different in fundamental principles from the philosophy of its humanism, or pure science. It has but one order of logic for the investigation both of the knower and of the known.

The idea of man's original perfection, of the unity and solidarity of the race, are regnant ideas both in its theology and in its philosophy. In its theology they are dogmas, and in its philosophy they are traditional facts; and it never loses sight of these fundamental truths of human history, life, and destiny in the exercise of its formative and sustaining power, influencing and regulating, sanctioning and defending the solidarities of social, civil, national, and religious life.

It is precisely the affirmation of these truths which puts it into antagonism with all the characteristics that have been noted of the

philosophy of individualism, inspiring opposite sentiments and directing the attention of mankind to the attainment, in one or another order, of a common destiny of glory, honor, progress, and happiness. Stimulating individual excellence, it does so, not for its own sake, but with a view to the superior perfection of the individual as one of many brethren, with whom, if he enjoys superior advantages, he is bound by obligation of a common responsibility which becomes heavier as his personal acquirements are the greater.

Thus it alone has offered to mankind a universal brotherhood, and has been able to diffuse the spirit of a fraternal love which, despite all the necessary diversity of human conditions of life, confers the boon of a supereminent equality fully and practically realized; an equality which is one of the greatest marvels of the world and for which its enemies in vain seek for a solution outside of its own principles. While regarding the acquisition of knowledge, of wealth and power as both legitimate and laudable, which individualism, true to its egoistic principles, fosters and encourages to exaggeration, to the aggrandizement of self-interest and self-conceit, the philosophy of our religion, as the highest and purest altruism, enforces the doctrine of the community of all goods in so far as the common right to life, liberty, and happiness may lay claim under the title of a common responsibility which equally binds the learned and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the capitalist and the laborer, the governor and the governed, a responsibility of reciprocity.

This true philosophy of happiness, as it is of human perfection, is far from placing the means of either in the attainment of any created good for its own sake; whence, among those nations where the Church has been supreme we observe a certain indifference manifested towards the gaining of riches, and the pursuit of mere animal comforts and luxuries; in broad contrast to that feverish, jealous hankering for the amassing of colossal wealth and its enervating environments, which are the well-known and deplorable fruits of individualism, at the expense not only of health and social harmony, but also of those nobler and more refining manners and vigorous virtues for which the civilizations of those people influenced by the philosophy of Catholicity have been signally distinguished.

If Catholic nations worthy of the name have ever been distinguished for their spirit of content with what is moderate, plain, and simple, and for which they are reviled by an age whose god is the almighty dollar, and which hails the invention of every new luxury as a sign of progress, it is because their philosophy was founded not only in the doctrine of Christ which declared the poor as the blessed ones of the earth, but also in the truth of reason

that "*virtus rerum in medio consistit.*" They had their kings and princes, their nobles and lords of great estates it is true, as they had and still have their republics, but they offer to our view a self-respecting, free, virtuous and contented people, firm in the defence of their civil and religious liberties, unenvious of those upon whom Providence had bestowed special powers and wealth. "For aught I see," says an old writer, "they are as sick that surfeit with too much as they that starve with nothing: it is no mean virtue to be seated in the mean." Their philosophy was well expressed by an ancient statesman: "The majority of citizens should be neither too rich nor too poor. Those who are too rich become often proud and insolent, and the poor vile and cunning. The greater number of moderate fortunes, the greater will be the stability of states. A universal mediocrity in this respect is the most wholesome." And history confirms the acceptance of this doctrine when it shows us that until the disastrous revolt of Protestantism, the legitimate child of an antagonistic doctrine, there were so few of the "too poor" to be found in Catholic nations that such institutions of egoistic charity as the "poor-house" and the name of "pauper" as a recipient of enforced state benevolence were utterly unknown.

The enormous and unjust inequalities in worldly possessions which now prevail in modern society, resulting in a threatened disruption of the whole social order, the fears of which are boldly confessed on every page of contemporary literature, cannot be laid at the doors of the Church. It had its high and low classes, its noble and peasant, its prince and mechanic, but it never had, in the days of its "omnipotence" in human affairs, a class out of which were spawned a Communist or a piratical "Trust" company. It has been left to the philosophy of individualism to found the base order of the Plutocrat, and determine the rank of the gentleman by the amount of stock one holds in wealthy corporations; to stir up in the popular mind a morbid craving for the possession of wealth, with all its diabolical train of envy and jealousy between the rival competitors in the mad race for gold, and of murderous hate in the breasts of those who have been thwarted in their desires; to breed a class of bank robbers, of peculating employees, of bribed legislators, of stock-watering thieves, all of whose "operations" are daily heralded and commented upon in language which shows that the popular conscience is so blunted as to deem these iniquities fitting subjects rather for satirical humor than for denunciation, in terms of horror and shame, on account of the indelible disgrace which should attach, not only to the criminal, but to the whole fraternity of our humanity.

He who changes the principles of his philosophy is, perforce, obliged to either adopt a new terminology or falsify the existing

one. Fraternity, Liberty, and Equality are terms as old as Catholicity; and are, indeed, words of spirit and of life in her mouth of no doubtful meaning. Adopted, as they have been, as a shibboleth by the Socialists, they have been employed as watchwords of open and secret societies whose aim is the destruction of all order by machinations against established peace, and the spread of doctrines which would abolish all legitimate authority, the rights of property, and ultimately lead to the denial of all moral virtue and responsibility. Catholic philosophy, true to its principles of the solidarity and unity of the race, feared not to demand both the manners and the moral obligations implied by all those terms. If it taught men that they were brothers, it led them to treat each other as brethren. Nothing is so conspicuous, even at the present day, among those peoples who inherit more or less of the faith and manners of Catholic times, than the mutually polite and urbane bearing and speech, alike of the high and low, the rich and poor, while preserving a singular air of nobility and self-respect which even the very beggar does not lose. Chateaubriand observes that "one can never remark in Spain any of those servile airs or turns of expression which announce abjection of thoughts or degradation of mind: the language of the great seigneur and of the peasant is the same, the greeting the same, the customs, the compliments, the manners are the same."

Another writer gives a singular testimony: "Spain," he says, "is the true land of equality. The least beggar lights his *papelito* at the *puro* of the greatest lord, who allows him to do so without the least affectation of condescension. Strangers, and above all the English, have great difficulty to put up with this familiarity. Servants are treated with a sweetness very different from our affected politeness, which seems each moment to remind them of the inferiority of their condition."

"I will say for the Spaniards," says still another observant traveller, "that in their social intercourse no people exhibit a juster feeling of what is due to the dignity of human nature, or better understand the behavior which it behooves a man to adopt towards his fellow-beings. The wealthy are not idolized; the duke or marquis can scarcely well entertain a very overweening opinion of his own consequence, as he finds no one to fawn upon or flatter him." The whole Spanish literature, says Kenelm Digby, is stamped with this character. "Often have I heard it said and related by our Ancients," says the author of a Spanish romance, "that one ought never to magnify any man for his riches, nor to esteem him less for his poverty, however great it may be." And again: "In Spain the dignity of the man seems to rise in proportion as his rank descends." "In our Galicia," says Sanchos, "the blood is so

generous that the only thing which distinguishes the poor man from the rich is that the former is obliged to serve." What but Catholicity, asks the writer from whom the above is quoted, could have so reversed all notions of the pagan world? And we may also ask what but Catholicity now has the power to reverse the notions of our present revived paganism in society, and establish true fraternal relations among the warring classes which Socialism, with the cry of Fraternity upon its lips and jealous enmity in its heart, has created.

If the blood of the Spaniards was esteemed as of so generous a nature as to confer an equal social nobility upon both rich and poor, it is simply because they were apt scholars in the school of a generous philosophy; one which knew how to proclaim and dared defend the common dignity of human nature, and whose teaching and training established not a factitious brotherhood of mankind of empty name and of treacherous deeds, but a real fraternity founded upon the basis of a pure and exalted altruism whose ideal was drawn from the divine fraternal relations established by Jesus Christ, the Catholic Saviour of mankind, and which realized in wondrous and countless examples the virtues of loyalty, fidelity and honor, of amenity of manners and benignity of heart, and, above all, of self-sacrifice carried to a pitch of heroism the very possibility of which the modern mind accepts with difficulty.

One of the greatest marvels that impresses the mind of the historian is that the Church was not only able to transform the whole order of pagan civilization by bringing all men under its sway to regard each other as brethren, but that it was able to inspire them with a sense of equality, despite the manifold and necessary physical, mental and moral inequalities of mankind, and that, too, not by depressing the high and more worthy, but by elevating the low and mean.

That all men are by nature free and equal, is a doctrine which was first promulgated to a world of tyrants and slaves by the voice of the Church. And what it taught by word of mouth, it had the power to realize in deeds. Only of a nation brought thoroughly under the influence of Catholic teaching could the following anecdote be related: "A king, leaving his palace in company with some courtiers, passed a beggar standing at the gate, to whom he gave an alms, at the same time lifting his jewelled cap in return to a similar salute from the beggar, adding with a gracious smile: "God keep thee, brother." Hearing which, one of the courtiers, affecting surprise at such a speech, said: "Is the beggar, then, one of your royal family?" "Nay," quickly responded the king, "he is not one of mine, *but I am one of his.*" This charming story, *si non e vero*, would certainly be judged as singularly *ben trovato* by

all familiar, through study or observation, with Catholic times and manners, so leavened as they were with the spirit of true equality that the king's daughter was held to be every boy's sister; the little prince every sister's brother.

Modern Socialism is not without its boast of equality as one of its ideal maxims. But who that hears of the various Utopian schemes offered by them as panaceas for all the grievous ills now affecting the social order, cannot see that they hold up to the view of the suffering masses, to whose biased judgment alone they cunningly address their appeal, a spectacle of equality as contemptible in its nature, being nothing more than the establishment of an autocratic state, of which all citizens are reduced to a common slavery as the price of the satisfaction of their mere animal appetites, as it is utterly hopeless of realization; thus cruelly goading on an already over-exasperated and blind multitude to the madness of despair. Persuaded that they are the victims of social injustice, they are easily duped into rushing to the destruction of the whole social fabric, oblivious of, or too ignorant to comprehend, the lessons of an inexorable logic that reformation of society must begin by the reformation of men who make society what it is; that society can have no autonomy apart from the men who constitute it, and therefore the disruption of a present order arraigned as guilty of injustice is no guarantee of a better order at the hands of the very men yet unreformed, who are, themselves, the responsible transgressors.

Certainly not by Socialist doctrine, which denies both the existence and possibility of sin in man, while absurdly illogical enough to denounce in the same breath his chief work, the social state, as one worthy of condemnation and death for its crimes.

The fundamental doctrine of Socialism, that sin is not in man, but only essential good (though by a most inconceivable inconsistency they demand of men a common sacrifice to the ideal god of society they propose to set up for adoration), we find very carefully kept in the background by these Utopian philosophers in their works until they have presented to their dupes the enticing bait of a social plan (it has no pretension to be called order) where all will be equally rich and powerful, all equally clothed, fed, lodged and amused. A notable exemplification of this is seen in that late clever, but specious, Socialistic production, "Looking Backward," by Edward Bellamy, in which this ruse is skilfully performed. It is only when we come to the telephoned sermon near the close of the book that there is the least pretense to offer to the reader anything in the shape of a principle or argument upon which to base the possibility or reasonableness of the Utopian republic so clearly depicted in detail. Then, amid much platitudinous talk, the Socialistic doc-

trine of man's essential goodness and, by implication, his freedom from all moral responsibility, is deftly sandwiched in as the *raison d'être* of the whole fatuitous scheme. A fitting comment upon all that precedes it, and which is evidently used as bait to catch the unreasoning vulgar eye, may be summed up in the language of a quaint old writer, the *Sieur Charron*, in his "Book on Wisdom": "The common people have no other Notion of the public Good but what they are sustained by; nor can you make them believe that any other, either Duty or Benefit, is incumbent upon, or to be expected from, those that sit at the Helm comparable to that of feeding the Subject; as if Society and Government were instituted for no other purpose than to see that the vulgar and poorer sort of Men should never want a full Belly" (vol iii., p. 1089). One cannot but admire the ingenious special pleas which appear on every page of Mr. Bellamy's book; but we are not at all surprised to find him, in company with all philosophers of the Socialist school, inconsistent and illogical when he attempts to grasp the solution of the real problem he has in hand. It is presuming a little too much upon the credulity of his readers to blandly take it for granted, as he does, that all care, sorrow and crime are the results of a defective, comfortable, physical maintenance, and of ignorance in scientific education. But even the cure of society by the elimination of physical suffering and ignorance being supposed, he is obliged to confess that the ideal of perfect human happiness is not yet attained. Playing the role of preacher, he thus summarizes the doctrines of his Credo: "The betterment of mankind from generation to generation, physically, mentally, morally, is recognized as the one great object supremely worthy of effort and sacrifice. We believe the race for the first time to have entered on the realization of God's ideal of it." Who has revealed to him that God's ideal is of a world-life of mankind which shall know neither poverty, care, sorrow, ignorance nor sin? We would be pleased to be told why this presumed divine ideal is not already realized or was not from the beginning, and what brought into the world and kept there (until his visionary date of 2000 A.D.) all the care, sorrow, ignorance and sin of which the world's history is one continuous record. The Socialist is obliged to both assert and deny the existence of evil, to proclaim that it never had a cause, and yet denounce mankind for not setting to work to dismiss it incontinently from the face of the earth. We would like to see something else than mere assertion that all divines and philosophers hitherto have been wrong in their estimate of man as a sinner. Who is to blame for the existence of "the constant pressure" upon this "essentially good" being "through numberless generations of conditions of life which might have perverted angels"? If man is not the sin-

ner, who is? Is it God? And if this were not so inconsistent as to defy comprehension, we find upon the very next page a singular contradiction to the whole Socialistic thesis in his affirmation of the Catholic dogma of man's constitution in original perfection: "It is a pledge of the destiny appointed for us that the Creator has set in our hearts an infinite standard of achievement, judged by which our past attainments seem always insignificant, and the goal never nearer;" a doctrine the consequences of which we have sufficiently enlarged upon in a former part of this essay. Yet this facile writer does not shirk the writing of fine sentences at the risk of taking back on a second page what he has asserted on the first. For, a few lines further on, we find "the return of the race to God" defined as "the fulfilment of its evolution, when the divine secret hidden in the germ shall be perfectly unfolded." Mr. Bellamy is not, so far as this book gives evidence, a disciple of Darwin, but he is a Socialist; and all Socialists are disciples of the school of individualism who, by either name, deny the true solidarity of humanity, deny original sin and its consequences, and, with the usual inconsistency of error, loudly call for reform of a degenerate social order, *the work of man who is not degenerate*. The consequence of such doctrine is plain. There is no original responsibility in man for the care, sorrow, crime and death of which the world is full, neither for the evils of society so much deplored and illogically denounced. All this is nothing but man's "return to God by way of natural evolution of his essentially good nature." There is no more sin in the grievous hurts under which humanity suffers, either in individuals or their associations, than there is in the hurts sustained by a little child who falls in his efforts to learn to walk. The *simile* is Mr. Bellamy's own. "We are now (A.D. 2000) like a child which has just learned to stand upright and to walk." A world without the possibility of sin would be a world without the possibility of moral responsibility. And yet, Mr. Bellamy and his fellow-Socialists find fault both with man and the society he has founded, or rather, after their illogical fashion of reasoning, both with any society not founded on Socialist self-contradictory and inconsistent principles, and with the man whom society has produced.

If the philosophy of Catholicity has ever been the persistent opponent of that logical outcome of individualism known as Secularism, in the family, in education, in government and in religion, it is because it alone affirms irrefragable principles of human liberty. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity are principles of mutual dependence, and resolve themselves into each other. As has been said of those theological virtues, "Now there abideth Faith, Hope and Charity, but the greatest of these is Charity," so the philosophy of Catholicity leads up to a like affirmation, "Now there abideth

Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, but the greatest of these is Fraternity;" for it is the spirit of human fraternity, forwarded upon the doctrines of the unity and solidarity of mankind, the first and last word of Catholicity, which inspires the aspiration for human liberty, fosters it, judges and defends it, and is impossible without it.

This is readily proved. For what is liberty? It is the enjoyment of the right to be and to do what one *ought* to be and to do. Eliminate the idea of duty and mutual responsibility, and he is a fool who does not see that such liberty as is then at man's disposal is license—the enjoyment of a supposed right of being and doing what it *pleases* one to be or to do; an expression of egoistic individualism so extreme that it is beyond anything to which barbaric savages have ever been supposed to have descended.

Without the doctrine of solidarity, as affirmed by the Church, true liberty is inconceivable, for upon this doctrine depends the idea of the possibility of society even the most savage. What is Secularism, and how does it nullify human liberty? Secularism is only a polite word for social Atheism, the last word of the self-conceited philosophy of individualism, which, in the expressive diction of the day, counts God out in all questions where man has the opportunity of voting; a stupid and self-destructive democracy which finds its blind adherents in all political parties in our beloved country, practically annulling the civil and religious rights guaranteed to a vast number of its common citizens.

The atheistic principle of Secularism nullifies liberty. How? By rendering the exercise of it impossible through denial of the means of its exercise. What are these means? The practice of obedience for love (in the spirit of fraternity) to legitimate authority. The obedience of fear rendered by a slave is not the means of liberty; neither is forced obedience to unlawful and tyrannical authority.

Legitimate authority must first be posited before even rights can be either affirmed or defined; and the enjoyment of them, which is liberty, is equally referable to it, both for its definition and defence. Liberty is not self-defined nor self-guaranteed. That is the fallacious dream of individualism under the title of Anarchism, which is a logical deduction from the denial of sin, for the negation of sin is a denial of responsibility to law. The idea of penalty thus vanishes with the rejection of all authoritative power in government, human or divine. This is succinctly expressed by M. Proudhon, at once Socialist, Anarchist and Atheist. He says in his "Confessions of a Revolutionist": "All men are free and equal. Society is then, as well by its nature as through the function for which it is destined, autonomous, that is to say, having the right of self-government. The sphere of activity of each

citizen being determined by the natural division of labor, and by the choice which he makes of a profession, and the social functions being combined so as to produce a harmonious effect, order results from the free action of all. From this must proceed the absolute negation of government; therefore he who attempts to govern me is a tyrant and usurper, and I declare him to be my enemy." Secularism is here distinctly affirmed in claiming a complete autonomy for that "collective being called Society," as M. Proudhon elsewhere terms the social order of humanity according to Socialist doctrine, which, as said before, is essentially atheistic. He talks of the "logic inherent in humanity," of the "superior reason residing in it." The absurdity of such a claim hardly needs demonstrating, since what is denied of the individual cannot be affirmed of the species.

This "collective being called Society," according to all Socialists, is a sort of collective or conglomerate deity to take the place of the one True God, and whose visible personification, to be servilely adored as the supreme wisdom and source of all right, they have all agreed to find in the State. It is then the triumph of Socialist ideas when we see the State assuming control over the laws of marriage, which govern the existence and defence of the family, over the education of children, and compelling even the Church to acknowledge it as either supreme head or supreme protector. That the liberty and equality of social, civil and religious rights guaranteed to us Americans by the Constitution are not based upon the individualistic doctrines of Socialism is a truth which we fancy no true American citizen would think of questioning for a moment, yet the daily encroachments of State power in absorbing the rights of the individual, following upon the base and supine yielding up of those rights one after another by men with "Liberty and Equality" upon their lips, but with the spirit of servitude in their hearts, setting up a tyrannical Moloch of their own fashioning, to which they are blindly sacrificing themselves, their children, their honor, and the sacred dignity of their human nature, now more justly termed state-like than god-like, all this widespread and daily increase of the influence of the philosophy of the would-be "omnipotent" individualism is unquestionably preparing the way for the ultimate triumph of Socialism and the consequent revolution which would make us a nation of slaves. Yet the writer in the *New York Herald* tells us that "authority goes for nothing with us, and reverence for it is every year on the decrease." What can he possibly mean by "authority"? Does he mean to assert that reverence for that divine authority to whose sanction alone we can presume to refer the divine ideal of a republic which we proudly claim to have set up and are laboring to realize, is daily on the decrease; and that we have

already so far lost all consciousness of the ultimate *raison d'être* of our national existence and glorious prestige that it can be truly said that it "goes for nothing with us"? Alas! then is the sacrifice of our boasted liberties nigh completed, and the last link is being forged of the fetters with which socialistic individualism would bind the freest and noblest child of Liberty ever baptized at the font of God's politically regenerated humanity.

Although the writer's assertion greatly exaggerates the truth, and was doubtless made use of as mere clap-trap to furbish up the worn-out absurdity that obedience to the spiritual authority of the Holy Father contravenes loyalty to all civil government, and is especially incompatible with true obedience to our own republican institutions, yet it is so far true that the poison of individualism is undoubtedly weakening the due respect for legitimate authority in both the spiritual and the temporal order to such a degree that the wise and good are beginning to entertain just fears for the ultimate consequences of its increase, and are casting about for the affirmation of the very principles assuring national stability and peace which only Catholic philosophy can furnish. The writer's language plainly offers about as complete a condemnation of the philosophy he exalts as one could well wish to see.

Liberty is no bastard offshoot from the unconsecrated cohabitation suggested and devised by individualism. It is the legitimate offspring of a divinely sanctioned union, and lawful heir to all the rights and privileges possessed by its noble parentage.

Again we repeat it, Liberty is not self-defined nor self-guaranteed. Reposing upon responsibility, it must be both defined and guaranteed by legitimate authority, which must posit the criterion of responsibility and define the limit of obedience and duty. Authority as such has nothing to do with what it *pleases* one to be or to do, but it has all to do, as is evident, with what one *ought* to be and to do; by definition, judgment and vindication of right, no less than the just exaction of duty.

Secularism, the godless social order, is the enemy, the very denial of human right and liberty, by the denial of the divinely legitimate authority vested in the institutions of the family, the State and in religion. Authority logically correlates an author. Who or what is the author of the family, of the State, of religion? Is it mankind, either in discrete individuals, or in collective humanity? That the authorship of neither man, the family society, the State, nor the Church is to be found in themselves is evident. For no reality posits its own ideal. The ideals of all these realities logically precede their existence, as they must be referred to for their *raison d'être* and their *raison d'agir*. Man is not his own author, because he does not posit the ideal either of his being or his act. As the founder of the family, of society, of

the State or Church, he is nothing but an instrument, realizing the divine ideals of these institutions. Not being his own nor their author, he is not the origin of his own or of their authority, which he or they exercise in the fulfilment of a divinely appointed destiny. Neither does authority find its origin in concrete humanity, as so confidently claimed by the individualistic Socialist. For what is his humanity or his society? Nothing but a "collective being," a conglomeration of distinct, diverse individuals. *Quod non habet, non dat.* If the source of authorship of the race, of family, State or Church, is not possessed by the individual, *i.e.*, by humanity or society in the discrete, neither can the individuals confer it upon humanity or society in the concrete. Are the individual stockholders of an insurance company, for example, either singly or collectively, the authors of their body, and do they give it authority? By no means. It is no body, has no real or legitimate existence or authority until the State, by the supreme authority vested in it, has declared it organic and conferred being and subordinate authority upon it. Both the humanity and society of the Socialist is precisely in the same condition; conglomerate, devoid of all principle of union and perpetuity, as they are utterly devoid of the characteristics of original authorship or the power to exercise or confer authority. In a word, their solidarities are not referable to a true origin of authority, and therefore cannot legitimately, because not logically, germinate other subordinate solidarities. And the family, the State and the Church would be in the same plight; devoid of an original authorship, to whose primal authority and will they owe their being, their rights and their liberty to be and do what they ought, and whose responsibility is a reflex of the original responsibility reposing in their author.

Secularism is the reposing of authority in a source which has no creative power, *i.e.*, in the creature of the individual, assuming the power and prerogatives belonging only to God, claiming the right to make or unmake the family, the State and the Church at its will. Secularism is the principle of all institutions which proclaim that they exist and act without God; and so we see such States developing, as we have had past and recent examples to prove, godless governments, flaunting the flag of a republic and wielding the sword of the autocrat, hanging with cowardly truculence upon the popular will for existence and the right to rule, the judiciary swayed by the political influence of the hour; the education of the masses cunningly claimed as a high prerogative of the godless State and becoming equally godless as it, nay, not godless, for the State has declared itself omnipotent, and has usurped the throne of sovereignty once held by the True Divine God, and presents itself as the new human god to be obeyed. So we see that this new sovereign divinity seizes at once by violence and con-

fiscation upon the property once given to and held as sacred to the honor and worship of the God it has dethroned. What wonder after this to find the human race itself attacked by claiming the right to make or unmake the family, which it dissolves by its laws of divorce in defiance of the fiat of the Old and True God! What wonder to see the State made up of *citizens* indeed, but who are no longer free and independent *men*! So we see the ignorant populace stimulated to rapine and revolution by socialistic denials of the rights of property, and claiming for the State the universal and absolute proprietorship of it. So we see State churches, their cringing hireling priesthood begging at the doors of their imperial master the dole of subsistence, and waiting for its beck and nod to preach the everlasting and supreme word of the Old and True God in terms to suit the taste of the new one and its blasphemous pretensions. Conceived by the spirit of the world and knowing no other end to propose to mankind but the possession of what the world esteems as good, we see the fruits of Secularism in the multiplication of soulless corporations and trusts, insolent and greedy capitalists absorbing the whole field of individual free labor, grinding the face of the poor, forcing them into its slave workshops, its brutalizing factories and mines, and mocking their helpless efforts for freedom of labor and appeals for just remuneration with the arrogant question: "Well, what are you going to do about it?" "Are we not brethren?" they cry. "Have we not human blood and feelings and aspirations for happiness as well as you?" "What responsibility have we whether you live or die?" is the response. "We are disciples of the new gospel—Every man for himself. If you want liberty and happiness, find it as best you can; we are not obliged to give it to you." Liberty with Secularism? The thing is a delusion; from which the enslaved people in vain strive to awake until there shall arise a saviour of his age who shall whisper in their ears the long-forgotten and long-despised name of God. To oppose the rapid descent to revolution and anarchy, to regenerate a depraved and suffering humanity that philosophy and that religion, which alone possesses the mysterious power of divine equilibrium, knowing as it does how to sanction, sustain and defend legitimate authority, without sacrificing the rights of the subject, must proclaim the rights, the liberty and justice of humanity as identified with the rights, the liberty and justice of God.

It has not been written in vain, "The poor man cried, and the Lord heard him." "Whatsoever God hath joined, let no man put asunder." "By Me kings reign and judges decree just things." "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Go preach the Gospel to every creature; whosoever heareth you, heareth Me."

The philosophy of Catholicity, as well as its religion, posits all

authorship and authority in God. As author of all humanity and its solidarities, He holds Himself responsible for what He has ordained. All the truth, goodness and beauty, all the reasonableness of being what it is and of acting as it does; that is, the essential conformity of the reality of any work with the ideal of its author and the rectitude or equilibrium which self-consciousness affirms as existing between its will and the author's will, and which constitutes the logical and ethical basis of what is called "right" and of the liberty of its exercise, must be identified with and referred to the personal authority and responsibility of its author. If man demands life, liberty and happiness in the exercise of his rights, in the social, political or religious order in his own name, he will receive nothing but the mocking answer, "Art thou stronger than I?" He must demand them in the name of God, their responsible author, and he shall not cry into an ear that heareth not, nor appeal to an arm that is not able to save. Catholic philosophy teaches its disciples, and Catholic faith inspires its believers to refer all the strength and hopes of human rights to the authority of the name of God. "*Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.*" "*In Te, Domine, speravi: non confundar in æternum.*"

In vain will the delusive philosophy of individualism comfort the victims of injustice and oppression with the pretence that when the crushed are in the majority, then relief can be had. Are rights only rights because the majority so adjudge them? Dashing this false and cowardly doctrine to the ground, and exhibiting it in all its absurd weakness, a man who, inspired for the moment by the truth and heroic philosophy of Catholicity, arose one day in the might and majesty of the truth which possessed him, and uttered a sublime sentence, which deserves to live forever: "Do you tell me that I speak in vain; that the majority is against me? I tell you that with God *one* is a majority."¹

If then by God's mercy there is to appear to this self-worshipping and self-willed age a saviour to whose life, words and spirit of self-immolation it is to owe its regeneration and deliverance from the degenerating and destructive influences of satanic individualism, it must now be quite evident what his doctrine will be. Under the encouraging teaching and beneficent influence of the philosophy of Catholicity, society, vainly seeking for a rational solution of its disorders elsewhere, will again take heart and resume its true relations with its divine author. Again will the ideal of man's original perfection as he came forth from the hand of the perfect author be set as a goal of divine attraction for all human life and effort. Again will man hear, and not as a chained slave despair of understanding the truth which makes him free. No

¹ Wendell Phillips.

longer will the doctrine of the Church, which weighs the material and temporal in the balance of the spiritual and eternal, be looked upon as paradoxical. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." "Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all other things will be added unto you." Again will arise the spirit of a true humanity, which will breathe hope into the aching breasts of the down-trodden peoples, the spirit of a divine liberty, equality and fraternity, whose sanction and defence has ever been, as it can only lie, in that divine philosophy which is the expression of the God-word in man, the logic of regenerated reason, the doctrine of the true and only Saviour of the world; which, indeed, like its author, can be scorned, traduced, scourged and crucified, but, like Him, will surely pass through the grave without corruption, and rise again heralding in the dawn of a new day of life, liberty and happiness for mankind.

CATHOLIC WORSHIP AND CHRISTIAN ART.

The Offices and Ceremonies of Holy Week. Card. Wiseman. London, 1839.

Genius of Christianity. Chateaubriand. Baltimore, 1856.

Histoire de l'Eglise. Par l'Abbé Darras. Paris, 1874-1888, Vol. 30, Appendix.

Mores Catholici; or, Ages of Faith. Digby. New York, 1888, Bk. III.

IT is impossible for one who studiously examines the majestic cathedrals of the old world, especially those that are still devoted to the purposes of Catholic worship, to be unimpressed by feelings of wonder and surprise; and if the student know aught of the Catholic ceremonial, and be withal an unprejudiced observer, he will be unable, as a result of his study, to resist the conviction that Mother Church has done both wisely and well in wedding Catholic worship to Christian art.

As he gazes on the gorgeous paintings and noble sculptures that adorn both nave and chancel; as his eye glances admiringly along the clustered columns that rise in stately splendor to the Gothic vault above; as he perceives the massive organ whence reverential music is wont to steal in waves of solemn sound; as he

reflects that the chancel often resounds with the voices of the clergy chanting "in sounds of sweetest melody" the sublime offices of the Roman liturgy, or declaiming in Gregorian song the matchless poetry of Mother Church, he must admit that each and all,—painting, poetry, sculpture, music, architecture, are means wisely made use of by the Catholic Church to draw men's souls with golden bands to Him who is her Spouse, to entrance the sense that thus she may captivate the intellect, making it submissive to the sweet yoke of Christ. And if he understand the motives of the Church in beautifying the chamber of her Bridegroom, he will not fail to realize that the marriage between art and worship is thoroughly in accordance with the wish, even with the *command*, of the Divine Founder of Christianity.

Catholic Worship and Christian Art is no doubt a beautiful theme, and many men of massive minds and facile pens have sought, with eminent success, to do it justice. The literature which it has occasioned is fully in keeping with the vastness of the subject; for it comprises, in historical extent, the nineteen hundred years that have elapsed since the dawn of Christianity, and deals with monuments of genius, with which the earth is widely dotted—monuments fashioned by the hands of faithful Catholic artists of both the present and the past; which are, in a manner, indestructible as the Church herself, and which shall continue to unfold their matchless grace and beauty wherever shine the rays of her benevolence and charity.

The writer does not in the least presume to treat the subject as it merits to be treated; nor will he, for he cannot, enter largely into details. An adequate treatise on the subject would fill many large volumes. This statement, though trite, is true, and evidence of its truth is not wanting. It is scarcely a decade since the learned Jesuit, Father Garucci, published a work bearing a title somewhat similar to that at the head of this article; and though that work consists of six volumes in folio, the descriptions and narratives which it contains come down to the eighth century only, —nearly six hundred years before the birth of Michel Angelo Buonarrotti, during whose lifetime Christian art, in all its branches, enjoyed a golden age.

It is the design of the writer to give a mere sketch or outline, and a meagre one at that, of the relation existing between Christian art and the worship of the Catholic Church, both as regards the *liturgy* of the Church and the *sacred edifices* wherein the offices of the liturgy are now or have been performed. In tracing this outline, he has found it necessary, when treating of certain branches of art, to mention one or two works or specimens only—not because there are not more, for their name is indeed legion; but

simply because they are sufficient to suit his purpose. Neither has he, in exercising his choice of specimens, always given the preference to those that are considered the most striking or the most beautiful; for that would involve, in many cases, a wealth of description and a mass of detail altogether incompatible with the length of a REVIEW article. He has, therefore, taken the liberty to select, almost at random, from among so many works that are all beautiful.

From what has already been written, it is hardly necessary to premise that the words "Christian art," as used in this article, convey the idea of the fine arts as wedded to worship, as a vehicle of moral instruction, as employed entirely and only for the furtherance of the ends of religion.

Fully to realize the influence of Catholic worship on the rise, progress, development and perfection of Christian art, it is necessary to understand the object of the Church in employing the beautiful in her religious services, and in the erection and adornment of her sanctuaries.

Her object may be briefly stated as the salvation of mankind. As salvation cannot be accomplished without faith which "cometh by hearing," the necessary means to its attainment is the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. "Going, therefore, *teach* all nations!" "*Preach* the gospel to every creature!" This is her commission. She must go unto the ends of the earth, seek out every rational creature and preach to him, teach him what Christ commands, administer to him the sacraments, which are the mysteries of God, and demand his obedience to Christian law. She is not to hand him a book and say: "Read and be saved." She is to *teach* and to *preach*; for this did she receive the gift of tongues and the divine fire of the Holy Ghost.

We know the great diversity existing among men, whether as individuals or as nations; we are acquainted with the many obstacles in the ordinary path to knowledge and belief; and yet, all nations must be taught, and the Gospel must be preached to every creature: to the ignorant, who are not moved by the beauties of rhetoric or by elegance of diction, as well as to the learned, who are; to those who are deaf as well as to those who can hear; to the blind as well as to those who can see; to the refined and cultured; to the rich, the poor, the master and the slave. Moreover, it must be preached to these in the most effective manner, that all may realize, as best they can, the facts of the Bible narrative, unroll the past and gaze on it as present. They are to be witnesses in particular of the principal scenes in the life of the Saviour, and to feel in the inmost recesses of the heart the emotions these should

naturally awaken. They are to listen to the joyful song of angels as on Christmas morning they proclaim the Saviour's birth, and be present with the shepherds who adore Him in simple, trusting faith; they must gaze on Simeon in the temple with the Christ-child in his arms, and listen to the farewell canticle of the Old Testament as it gives way to the New; they must bow in adoration with the Wise Men of the East, follow the fleeing Infant into Egypt, wander back again to Nazareth, behold the opened heavens at the Jordan, assist at each act and parable of the "public ministry," sympathize with the sufferings of Christ's passion, feel to some extent the emotions that then thrilled the heart of Jesus, stand with Mary and John and Magdalen "amid the encircling gloom" on Calvary, share with the apostles in the joy of the Resurrection, and stand on Olivet with the men of Galilee to gaze on Jesus as He enters into His glory.

For all this, spoken language is not enough; the Church must use, in addition to it, the language of signs and symbols, the doleful sounds of grief, the harmonious measures of joy. It is for this reason that she adorns the walls of her temples with the Stations of the Cross; for thus we may follow the Saviour, step by step, from Pilate's hall to Calvary, and thence unto the tomb. The half-opened lips of the dead Christ hanging on the Cross, above the altar, speak to us of the enormity of sin; His transpierced heart tells the story of infinite love; His outstretched arms denote that His redemption would extend to all mankind, but His feet are fixed, and men must come to Him. Mary, too, is near—the mother of joys and sorrows—and, as we gaze on her heavenly countenance, she seems to tell us to bear our trials with resignation, to let the light of faith shine through our tears, giving them the beauty of the rainbow, and reminding us of God's promise of a brighter day beyond the clouds. We think of how, in far Judea, an angel came in the long ago and hailed a gentle maiden as the mother of the world's Redeemer. We follow her through joy and sorrow to Egypt, to Nazareth, to Jerusalem, to Calvary; there we become her children; she, our mother. Then, after Jesus has ascended to the "right hand of God the Father Almighty," we behold her with the apostles in the upper room where God the Holy Ghost descends in tongues of fire. And now we remember that she is with her divine Son once more—that good Son who can refuse her nothing, and we know that "she is standing between us and the Deity, intercepting somewhat of His awful splendor, but allowing His love to stream upon us more intelligibly to human comprehension through the medium of a woman's tenderness."—(Hawthorne: "*Blithedale Romance*.") Thus our thoughts are elevated and purified, and our lives are made more holy. Above the

springing arches and on the chancel walls are ranged, perhaps, the prophets and the evangelists, the patriarchs of the Old Law, the confessors of the New. Isaias tells us that a child shall be born to us; John the Baptist announces that he is here; Matthew tells of the temporal, and John of the eternal generation of the Son of God. In the representation of a Borromeo or of an Assisi, we understand to what heights of sanctity man can rise, whether girded round by riches and wearing the silken garments of a prince, or in the midst of poverty, bare of foot and clothed in the meanest serge.

It is, therefore, in accordance with the divine commission of the Church to make use of the beautiful for the purpose of conveying religious instruction; thus she Christianizes the feelings of the human heart; thus she promotes religion by rendering it attractive; thus she teaches it to many who otherwise would never learn its saving truths nor practise its salutary teachings; thus, in a word, she renders fruitful the indissoluble union, brought about and consecrated by herself, between Catholic Worship and Christian Art.

Everything that is great had its humble beginnings, its various stages of development, and then its full ripe growth. The sturdy oak that scarcely trembles in the storm, was once a tiny acorn; the mighty river was a rill. So it was with Christian as with pagan art; for the frescoes of Buonarrotti, as well as the statues of Praxiteles, are the results of ages of development, of centuries of ceaseless evolution. The reason is, that perfection is not the work of an instant, and is rarely, if ever, the work of man.

The first Christian painters and sculptors were dwellers in the Catacombs. No matter how the question as to the original purpose of these excavations may be decided, it is sufficient for the writer's object to recall the fact that, when the furious tide of persecution rolled over the Roman Empire, the Christians fled to these for protection. Beneath the streets and palaces of Imperial Rome were hewn still other streets; and, as the famous *ways* above were lined with the stately tombs of Roman noblemen and heroes, so too, in the *loculi* of the galleries beneath the Christians interred the remains of their martyred brethren. In places where galleries converged were widened spaces, not unlike the forums of the city; in these rude oratories the persecuted people met for prayer; assisted at the solemn offices of the Church and partook of the Most Holy Sacrament. Their religion was proscribed; for, to be a Christian was to be a traitor to the state as well as an enemy of Jupiter; and the punishment was torture and death. Every man suspected his neighbor; the father dragged his son before the tri-

bunal; the daughter gave evidence against her mother. Under such circumstances the utmost precaution was necessary. Hence, while Christians refrained from pagan practices, they studiously concealed the evidences of their being followers of the Nazarene. Their very speech was clothed in ambiguity, and the "discipline of the secret" was in force.

Of necessity, the effects of this restraint are visible in the Christian worship of that period, and even more so in the works of art. As examples of the former, we have the offices of Tenebræ, or Darkness, and the Mass of Holy Saturday, which were wont to be celebrated at the midnight hour.

The paintings of the catacombs consist chiefly of symbols and scenes from Scripture history, so painted as to refer to the state of affliction in which the Church then was. The symbolic paintings are many. The laurel, the olive, and the palm signify respectively victory, peace, and final triumph; the Holy Spirit is represented by the dove, while hope for the heavenly port finds its expression in the anchor; the stag is the symbol of the soul's thirst after the living fountains of paradise, and the peacock of the Christian's belief in immortality; the vine and its branches typify Christ and His disciples; the cross is the emblem of redemption, and the ship an image of the Church. The Saviour Himself is variously represented as the Good Shepherd, the Lamb, and as a fish. The reason of the latter representation is well known; the Christians used each letter of the Greek word *ichthus* as an initial of a name or appellation of Jesus Christ, viz., I-esous, Ch-ristos, Th-eou, U-ios, S-oter (*i.e.*, Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour).

Representations of the Blessed Eucharist are many and varied; and the multiplication of the sacramental presence seems to have been a favorite subject. Most often this is represented by dishes containing fishes, and small round loaves with crosses imprinted thereon; yet this is not the only pictorial record of the belief of the first Christians in the eucharistic doctrine. There is a painting of the scene in IV. Kings, iv., 1-8, wherein it is stated that the prophet Eliseus miraculously increased the small store of oil which a certain widow possessed, so that it filled not only her own vessels, but also all that she could borrow from her neighbors; the symbols or emblems on this picture prove that it is eucharistic.

In the Kircher museum at Rome there is a glass jar bearing the representation of a fish on a gourd. As the Christians were desirous of representing the dogmas of the Church in such a manner as to conceal them from the pagans, the "fish on the gourd" was certainly a puzzle to the uninitiated. It simply states the fact of Christ's burial and resurrection; the fish typifies Christ; the gourd refers to Jonas the prophet, who reclined under a gourd

which the Lord had prepared to shield him from the rays of the sun. Both together make us recall the words of our Lord: "As Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights, so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights (Matthew xii., 40).

Although there were crosses everywhere in the Catacombs, there is not to be found a painting of the Crucifixion. For this there were many reasons, among which two may be cited: it was very important in the early days of the Church to avoid anything that would be the occasion of pain to converts from Judaism; and, secondly, it was necessary to guard against the mockery of the pagans. The little that these latter knew, or more often *guessed*, concerning Christian doctrines, served as a basis for ridicule, and as an occasion for keeping alive the spirit of persecution. Thus we remember how Christians were called "cowardly worshippers of an ass's head." Again, it is well known that there was a caricature of the crucifix scratched on the wall of Cæsar's house in the pages' department. This consists of a human figure with an ass's head; the arms are outstretched, while at the back of the figure is a cross made of two intersecting lines. One of the pages, Alexemenos, no doubt a Christian, is represented as giving the salute *ad os* to this figure, while under it is rudely traced in Greek the inscription: "Alexemenos adores his God." This caricature dates from the first century, and the mere fact of its existence serves to corroborate what has been written above.

The paintings found in the catacombs have many striking peculiarities. A reference will be made to only one; one which, long misunderstood, has given occasion to scoffers to say that the early painters were as ignorant of Scripture history as they were of painting. This peculiarity has various names, but it may be called *compenetration*. That is to say, there seems to be an interpenetration, if we may so call it, of several scenes of sacred history in the same picture; or, the fulfilment of a prophecy is shown in what should be the original scene; or, an application of an Old Testament scene is made to a doctrine of Christianity. To illustrate the first: we have a representation of the Fall; in this we have the temptation of Eve by the serpent, her temptation of Adam, his accusation of the woman, and the discovery of their shame and nakedness. These events happened at different times, and yet they are all placed in the same picture. The serpent is twisted about the tree; Eve holds out the apple to her husband; Adam stands at a distance, in the act of making an accusation, while both are covered with the aprons of fig leaves.

With regard to the second species of compenetration, which may be said to be the most usual, we have a painting in which Christ,

instead of Moses, is represented as striking the rock in the desert. Now we know that "the rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x., 4), and hence we grasp at once the meaning of the picture: that it is *from* Christ as the fountain head, and *through* Him as our Redeemer, that the saving waters of grace flow through the desert of sin.

As an example of the application of an Old Testament scene to a New Testament doctrine, there is a painting of an early date which conveys to our minds the dogma of Mary's all-powerful intercession. St. Peter and St. Paul are represented as holding up the hands of Mary, who stands between them in the attitude of prayer. We are instantly reminded of Moses on the mountain, his hands held up by Aaron and Hur, while his people battled against their enemies in the valley below. As the name of each personage is written in its proper place under each figure, it is impossible to mistake the identity of the three.

The sculpture of the Catacombs consists mostly of bas-reliefs, and these, like the paintings, are representations of Scriptural scenes, interspersed with symbols. In them, likewise, are to be found many instances of compenetration.

The Church was not destined to live forever in the Catacombs. After three hundred years of bloody persecution the dark waters of the awful deluge at last subsided, carrying with them the shattered remnants of a once proud paganism; the cross that appeared to the army of Constantine was the harbinger of peace. Washing the blood and dust from her bruised members, the Church came forth from her darksome caverns, arrayed herself in bridal glory, and ascended the throne of the Cæsars. The temples of the gods, as well as the basilicas, which had been the halls of justice, were transformed into places of Christian worship; and those whose hands had adorned the walls and ceilings of the Catacombs, now transferred their labors to this more promising field.

But Christian art was not destined to assume in Italy at this time a more distinctive form, nor yet to attain a healthy expansion. Constantine removed the seat of empire to the East, and civil disturbances, coupled with barbarian invasion, checked the development of art in the West, so that within two centuries Constantinople had become its principal seat.

To this period is to be ascribed the Byzantine style of painting, of which the most interesting remains are works in mosaic and illuminations of the Bible and of other sacred manuscripts. It must be remembered that during the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries the iconoclasts fought with all the fury of mistaken zeal against the development of Christian art; and were it not for the deathless energy with which the Catholic Church strove against those sacrilegious image-breakers, we would not have now the

meagre remnants of the Byzantine school. To prove that there is no exaggeration on this point, a quotation from Chateaubriand will not be out of place:

“The clergy had collected at the College of Orthodoxy at Constantinople the finest library in the world and all the masterpieces of antiquity. Here, in particular, was to be seen the Venus of Praxiteles, which proves, at least, that the founders of the Catholic worship were neither barbarians without taste, bigoted monks, nor the votaries of absurd superstition.

“This college was demolished by the iconoclast emperors. The professors were burned alive; and it was at the risk of meeting with a similar fate that some Christians saved the dragon’s skin, one hundred and twenty feet long, on which the works of Homer were written in letters of gold. The pictures belonging to the churches were consigned to the flames, and stupid and furious bigots, nearly resembling the Puritans of Cromwell’s time, hacked to pieces with their sabres the admirable mosaic works in the Church of the Virgin Mary at Constantinople, and in the Palace of Blaquernæ. To such a height was the persecution carried that it involved the painters themselves; they were forbidden under pain of death to prosecute their profession. Lazarus, a monk, had the courage to become a martyr to his art. In vain did Theophilus cause his hands to be burnt to prevent him from holding the pencil. The illustrious friar, concealed in the vault of St. John the Baptist, painted with his mutilated fingers the great saint whose protection he sought; worthy, undoubtedly, of becoming the patron of painters, and of being acknowledged by that sublime family which the breath of the spirit exalts above the rest of mankind.”—(*Genius of Christianity*.)

For a time it seemed as if the choir of Muses had left the earth forever. Yet all was not dark in Italy; a ray of light occasionally penetrated the gloom, as when Theodoric, Desiderius and Luitprand erected substantial churches, and Charlemagne built at Florence the Church of the Apostles, which to-day still stands, the pride of the age in which it was erected.

It was not, however, until about the thirteenth century that the clouds began to roll away; the dawn of a brighter era was at hand. The models of ancient Greece and Rome had not entirely disappeared. Nicolo Pisano made them live again in purest marble, and Giotto di Bondone, casting to the winds the traditions that had bound him to the stiff Byzantine school, stood forth in his originality the true regenerator of Christian art. Brighter and brighter grew that morning light, until in Angelo and Raphael arose twin luminaries who filled the world with admiration of their genius, whose names shall ever be synonyms of all that is perfect

in art, and whose works shall exist as long as that Church whose faithful children they were, and on which they still shed unfading glory.

From Rome the light soon spread afar, though its brightness was somewhat obscured by the smoke of burning abbeys and cathedrals which marked the progress of the "Reformation." This is written in sorrow, not in anger; although there be some who decry the Catholic Church as the enemy of art, and either ignorantly or maliciously ascribe to the "Reformation" whatever of progress has been made in the field of civilization since Christianity made its appearance on the earth. The sacrilegious vandals of the sixteenth century spared nothing. As Motley says in his "Rise and Fall of the Dutch Republic": "They destroyed for destruction's sake." One example alone will bear out this assertion. At Antwerp a mob attacked the great cathedral, overthrew the seventy altars, carried off the vestments and sacred vessels, demolished the great organ, the most perfect in the world, destroyed the statues, and hacked to pieces the splendid paintings which were the pride of Flemish art. On this subject our own Prescott says:

"The amount of injury inflicted during this period, it is impossible to estimate. Four hundred churches were sacked by the insurgents in Flanders alone. The damage to the cathedral of Antwerp, including its precious contents, was said to amount to not less than 400,000 ducats. The loss occasioned by the plunder of gold and silver plate might be computed; the structures so cruelly defaced might be repaired by the skill of the architect; but who can estimate the irreparable loss occasioned by the destruction of manuscripts, statuary and paintings?"

This from a non-Catholic historian! Should any one then be so presumptuous as to proclaim to an astonished world that Catholicity has been inimical to art, let him be reminded of two things: that the appearance of Protestantism was the signal for the destruction of all art, and that Luther blessed (!) this earth with his presence when the world was ablaze with light, during its second Augustan age—the glorious pontificate of LEO X!

Having written thus much concerning the development of painting and its twin sister under the influence of the Church, it is now in order to consider poetry and music in relation to the worship of the Catholic Church.

If we carefully examine the liturgy of the Roman Church, we shall find, without doubt, that the poetic idea runs through it all. In fact, the liturgy itself is an epic poem, whose subject is the Atonement. Every detail of the divine tragedy, from the first promise of a Redeemer to the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pen-

tecost, is presented to us with marvellous sublimity, with an elevation of language and a grandeur of action that are absolutely without parallel. The chief aim of the Church, as has already been noticed, is to substitute the past for the present, so as to make her children witnesses of the facts which she commemorates, and even to feel that they are actual participants in the actions which she represents. And, indeed, with reason; for, in the divine economy nothing can be merely historical; hence, when Mother Church commemorates, she represents, and when she narrates, she consecrates.—(Canon Oakley.)

Bearing this in mind, let us first examine the ecclesiastical year, which commences with the first Sunday of Advent. Here we have four successive Sundays set apart for the purpose of representing the four thousand years of expectation which preceded the coming of the Son of Man. During this period the Church calls on us to prepare ourselves for the coming of Christ as though His birth were really yet to take place.

On the first Sunday she sings with the Psalmist (Ps. xxiv.): "To Thee, O Lord, have I lifted up my soul, in Thee, O God, I put my trust; let me not be ashamed, neither let my enemies laugh at me, for none of them that wait on Thee shall be confounded." Thus, with the chosen people, we live surrounded by malignant enemies, yet we trust ever implicitly in the omnipotence and providence of Jehovah, Who will one day surely send "the desired of the eternal hills."

On two of these Sundays her prayers begin with the words: "O Lord, we beseech Thee, exert Thy power and come!" On the second Sunday the Collect reads thus: "O Lord, excite our hearts to prepare the ways of Thy only Son, that by His coming we may merit to serve Thee with purified minds!"

Thus we see that there is a constant ray of hope to light our footsteps to the cradle of the Lord: and it grows ever brighter as the days roll by. As we draw nearer to the great day of the Lord, the sounds of gladness increase. On the third Sunday we are thus exhorted in the words of St. Paul: "Rejoice in the Lord always! again I say, Rejoice! . . . Be nothing solicitous, but in everything, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your petitions be made known to God."

During the ember days of the last week, and also on the last Sunday, she heaves a hopeful sigh, and, with Isaias, prays the heavens to rain the JUST ONE, and the earth to bud forth the Saviour, while her Gospel tells us of John the Precursor, the "voice of one crying in the wilderness: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord!"

Brighter still that ray of hope! more harmonious the sounds of

gladness! On the very night before the Nativity, she speaks with unshaken confidence; "To-day you shall know that the Lord will come and save us, and *to-morrow* you shall see His glory." And again: "To-morrow shall be blotted out the iniquity of the earth, and the Saviour of the world shall reign over us."

This is truly magnificent, the highest form of poetical expression. And how sublimely the period of expectation terminates! The midnight hour of Christmas Eve has come. The churches are illuminated and the altars are ablaze with lights; the air is filled with the fragrance of frankincense and flowers; the kneeling worshippers are waiting in reverence and silence. At length, clothed in golden vestments, the ministers appear; they advance slowly to the foot of the altar; all hearts unconsciously swell with spiritual joy. Now they ascend the platform of the altar; clouds of incense roll to the vault above; the organ peals forth its swelling notes of harmony, and above all are heard the solemn words of Christ Himself, once spoken by the mouth of the royal prophet: "The Lord said to me: Thou art my Son, *this day* have I begotten Thee!" While present at such a scene and filled with its spirit, we cannot but feel that the great day of the Lord has come at last—the day of salvation has dawned, indeed; the sentiments of the humble shepherds become our own; our ears are tingling with song of the heavenly spirits; and with Mary and Joseph we adore in spirit our new-born King.

The poetic principle, as already mentioned, pervades the entire liturgy. Each succeeding Sunday unfolds some new mystery of the God-Man's life on earth, until on Ascension Day we stand in spirit on the summit of Mount Olivet, and thence behold Him taken from us into heaven. However, it is particularly during Holy Week that the poetry of Mother Church reaches the highest point of excellence.

On Palm Sunday we actually participate in a procession commemorating the triumphal entry of our Lord into Jerusalem; bearing palm branches in our hands, we sing joyous hosannas to the Son of David, the King who cometh in the name of the Lord.

On Wednesday, Thursday and Friday evenings are chanted the Lamentations of Jeremias, during the office called *TENEBRÆ*, or Darkness. The versicles and responses are so arranged as to seem spoken by the Saviour during His passion, so that His words of reproach and sorrow may excite in us feelings of repentance for our many sins.

On Thursday evening we witness the beautiful ceremony of the Washing of the Feet. We hear Peter saying to the Saviour: "Lord, why dost Thou wash my feet? Thou shalt never wash

my feet." And then comes soft and low the answer of our loving Lord: "If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with Me."

On Good Friday the sombre drapings and the vestments of deepest mourning, the desolate altar and the open tabernacle, the plaints of mourning and the cries of woe, give evidence of the great grief of the widowed Bride of Christ. The history of His sufferings is recited in Gregorian chant; and, when the last words on the Cross have been uttered, we prostrate ourselves in sorrow and meditate on the death of the Son of God. We are in spirit at the foot of the Cross on Calvary, amid the darkness and the gloom, weeping with Mary and John and Magdalen, striking our breasts like the many that were there, and confessing with the centurion that this man is truly the Son of God.

But darkness does not last always; our woe must become less intense. Did He not give a promise, saying that on the third day He would rise again? In the very midst of our grief, Mother Church allows us to catch a glimpse of the dawn of Easter Day; for, on Holy Saturday, the tidings of the Resurrection are communicated, the ALLELUIA is intoned, and we are told that Mary Magdalen and the other Mary have gone to see the sepulchre.

And now, on Easter morning, the hymns of joy and the songs of praise! The VICTIMÆ PASCHALI LAUDES is intoned and sung in rhythmic melody. Magdalen comes running to us, and we anxiously bespeak her thus:

"Tell unto us, O Mary,
What thou hast seen in the way."

She answers, joyfully:

"I have seen the sepulchre of the living Christ,
And the glory of His rising,
The angel ministers, the napkin and the cloths,
Christ, my hope, is risen again,
He shall go before you into Galilee."

And then we sing with rapture:

"We know that Christ has truly risen from the dead,
Thou, triumphant King, have mercy on us!
Amen. Alleluia."

It is hoped by the writer that the few examples he has given will serve to illustrate, at least in some degree, the poetry of Catholic worship. To grasp in its entirety the poetical idea which is contained in the liturgy would necessitate an examination of the entire ceremonial, a thing entirely beyond the compass of an article.

The music proper of the Church is called Gregorian, or "plain chant." When it was introduced into the Church is not definitely known. It was probably based on the Greek system. Eusebius, who flourished towards the close of the third century, says that in his time there were different places assigned in the churches to the old and the young psalm-singers. St. Augustine is authority for the statement that the great St. Ambrose of Milan was the first to introduce alternate chanting into the West. The Emperor Charlemagne delighted in this music so much that he often ascended the platform with the choristers, and made the walls of his cathedral at Aix resound with the accents of his beautiful voice. Pope Gregory the Great reformed the music of the Church, and gave to the octave scale the names which the notes still bear, A, B, C, etc. In the first half of the eleventh century the art of writing music on lines and in spaces was invented by Guido of Arezzo, a Benedictine monk, and thus the notation of the different tones was finally and systematically regulated.

The chief difference between the Gregorian and modern music is thus fully stated by Cardinal Wiseman :

"According to his (Gregory's) and the present systems of music, any of these notes (A, B, C, etc.) may be the key-note ; but then we now introduce as many flats and sharps as are necessary to make the tones and semitones fall at the same intervals in every major and minor key respectively. Hence, a melody written for one key can be sung upon another, without any change thence resulting except as to pitch. In the Gregorian chant, likewise, any note may be the key-note, but no sharps or flats are allowed excepting B flat in the key of F. Thus, in every key, the position of the semitone varies ; and a piece of music, composed on one key or tone, is completely altered, and becomes insufferable if transposed into another."—(Lect. II.)

This system of music is essentially melodic ; the music is to be sung in the same melody by all the voices. It is purely diatonic. According to Rousseau, "it is superior to all modern music in that pathos which a majestic strain can give to the human voice." It stands majestically alone ; and every modern effort to compose in imitation of it has signally failed.

Great corruptions crept early into church music, and it was very much degraded when Gregory XI. brought with him from Avignon his choir of French, Spaniards, and Flemings. These used harmonised music, in which no words could be distinguished. They had an idea that the Italians could not sing, and many are the jokes and sharp retorts of the latter at the expense of the foreigners. Baini, quoted by Cardinal Wiseman, relates two :

Pope Nicholas V. asked Cardinal Capranica, one day, what he

thought of his choir. His Eminence answered that they seemed to him like "a sackfull of young swine, for he heard a dreadful noise, but could distinguish nothing articulate." Cirillo Franchi describes them in 1549 as singing "with certain howls, bellowings, and guttural sounds, so that they more resemble cats in January than flowers in May."

These abuses soon reached their height, and then Palestrina appeared. He put an end to the discordant jarring, brought harmony back again to earth, and gave us that grand church music which can neither be surpassed, imitated, nor equalled. How plaintive, and yet how angelically sweet, is the music of the Lamentations! how prayerful and solemn that of the Preface and the *Pater Noster*! Then the chanting of the Passion on Good Friday; the loud and brusque recitative of the historian; the deep, pathetic and solemn bass of Jesus, and the high tumultuous treble of the Jewish rabble! What mournful cadence in the *Dies Iræ* and the *Stabat Mater*! What exultation in the Paschal hymn of the deacon, as on Holy Saturday he blesses the paschal candle!

When sung by many voices, Gregorian music is truly sublime and ravishing; its melodic nature seems to have been formed in Heaven. The four living creatures—the number of perfect harmony—sing "Holy, holy, holy, to the Lord God of armies!" The one hundred and forty-four thousand virgins who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, sing a song which none others know; while "thousands of thousands" sing in a voice like the roaring of the sea, that magnificent canticle, "To the Lamb that was slain."

The multitudinous singing of this grand church music is exquisitely touching, and entrancing in the extreme. The writer will never forget the thrill he felt when, in Montreal, at the Corpus Christi processions, amid the booming of cannon, the melodious chiming of numberless bells, and the deafening peals of the Gros Bourdon, he heard the glorious *Te Deum* swell to Heaven from the throats of sixty thousand men. Nothing on earth, he thought, could equal it. Yet, when the procession crowded into the grand cathedral of Notre Dame, where nearly twenty thousand people can be packed, the *Tantum Ergo* was intoned; thousands caught it up; it surged towards the altar of the Blessed Sacrament; then it swelled around the walls and echoed from the galleries above—such waves of gorgeous harmony! No wonder that the people felt the thrill! On every side, strong men and tender women were wiping away, as they sang, the tears they were unable to repress; and yet they were happy, for they felt that gladness of spirit which fills the human soul overflowing at the eyes.

The Christian art of each age bespeaks the condition and spirit of the Church at that period. Thus, as we have seen, the paintings and the sculpture of the catacombs reveal the state of affliction which was then the lot of the Church. Christian architecture forms no exception to the rule.

The first churches were the oratories shaped by the Christians among the tombs of their martyred brethren in the catacombs. Coming to the surface under Constantine, they seized on the basilicas and the temples of the gods, and converted them to Christian uses. Subsequent architecture copied Grecian models with but little change, except in the Byzantine and Románesque styles.

The Christian idea, however, is ever prolific. Therefore when, after ages of darkness, architecture with all the arts arose again in Italy, Michel Angelo built in mid-air "that vast and wondrous dome to which Diana's marvel were a cell," and that gorgeous temple was completed whose like is not in all the earth, which even the infidel Gibbon calls "the most glorious structure that has ever been applied to the use of religion."

"But thou, of temples old or altars new,
Standest alone with nothing like to thee.
. Majesty,
Power, glory, strength and beauty all are aisled
In this eternal ark of worship undefiled."—CHILDE HAROLD.

As early as the twelfth century the Church had at last secured full freedom to realize the divine idea in architecture. She had acquired religious liberty under the first Christian emperor; political liberty was guaranteed to her by the well-won victory of Hildebrand and his successors, and now she was in full possession of artistic liberty, gradually achieved from the time of Charlemagne to the reign of Louis the Fat. Now, if ever, is the time to show that she is progressive! If she now remain sterile, she may well merit everlasting reproach! Let us see whether she can produce anything to eclipse the glories of Grecian architecture, and let the "lazy monks" lead the way!

The northern nations, after sweeping over Europe like so many destructive tidal waves, had finally settled into political calm. Barbarism was fast giving way to civilization. The religion of Christ took possession of the north and demanded fitting temples for the worship of the Almighty. These people had no models, and, of course, they had no architects. But the monasteries had always been schools of art. The monks alone of all the world in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were the masters of Romanesque architecture. They went among the peoples of northern Europe,

bringing with them the arts and civilization. Untrammelled by traditions among peoples who had none, they began to modify the Italian type of architecture, and after scarcely thirty years of successive transformations they succeeded in creating that style so magnificent, so extremely beautiful, commonly, but erroneously, called the "Gothic." Of this style Henri Martin has said that "it is the most solemn form with which religious thought has ever been invested since the origin of worship."

The abbot Suger, the great prime minister of Louis the Fat, personally directed the construction of the church of St. Denis, which has been called by many competent critics "the first of the Gothic monuments." Desiring monolithic columns for his edifice, he was on the point of writing to the Pope for some which he had seen in the baths of Diocletian, but just then he discovered a new quarry, and immediately set about working it. Massive timbers were also needed. In vain did people tell the abbot that all the forests in the vicinity of Paris had been stripped of the largest trees; he and his workmen traversed the whole country, searching bravely everywhere, until at last they came to the forest of Yveline, where the abbot picked out several beautiful trees, and had them felled and carried away.

Beautiful churches on the same model sprang up as by magic; and everywhere under the direction of the monks. Scarcely had Gothic art sprouted forth than it was transplanted by the Cistercian monks, who hastened to carry it to the ends of the earth; so that there is scarcely a country of Europe whose first Gothic churches have not been erected by the sons of Norbert, or Odilon, or Bernard, or Bruno.

Lay architects were unknown until the year 1210, sixty years after the dedication of St. Denis. Guilds of workmen did not appear until ten years afterwards, in the latter part of the reign of Philip Augustus. For a long time, however, the direction of the work remained with the monks, and when this was taken from them, Gothic art began to decline. "It is remarkable," says Raymond of Bordeaux, "that religious architecture has always declined in the proportion in which laymen have been employed in it." "Without doubt," says Albert Lenoir, "the first lay architects called on to replace them (the monks) were but little different with regard to faith and science, but from generation to generation these indispensable qualities could only decrease in the secular life, and the fall of sacred art was the consequence."

The great difference between Gothic and Grecian architecture is thus stated by Cardinal Wiseman:

"The architectures of Greece and Rome, like their religion, kept their main lines horizontal or parallel with the earth, and

carefully avoided breaking this direction, seeking rather its prolongation than any striking elevation. The Christian architecture threw up all its lines, so as to bear the eye towards heaven; its tall, tapering and clustered pillars, while they even added apparent to real height, served as guides and conductors of the sense to the fretted roof, and prevented the recurrence of lines which could keep its direction along the surface of the earth. Nothing could more strongly mark the contrast between the two religious systems. The minute details of its workmanship, the fretting and carving of its many ornaments, the subdivision of masses into smaller portions, are all in admirable accord with the mental discipline of the time, which subtilized and divided every matter of its enquiry, and reduced the greatest questions into a cluster of ever ramifying distinctions. The "dim religious light" that passed through the storied window, and gave a mysterious awe to the cavern-like recesses of the building, excellently became an age passionately fond of mystic lore, and the dimmest twilights of theological learning. Nothing could be more characteristic, nothing more expressive of the religious spirit which ruled those ages, than the architecture which in them arose."

The purity of the Gothic does not exclude the peculiar genius of a nation; in other words, under the general inspiration a people does not lose its characteristics. The splendid genius of the French people has given us Notre Dame, the church of the monarchy; the cathedral of Rheims, the royal sanctuary; St. Denis, the mausoleum of the kingly dead; St. Severin, of Paris; Auxerre, Chartres, Amiens, Beauvais and a hundred other splendid piles. The patient perseverance of English thought is embodied in the wonderful cathedral of Salisbury, the choir of Ely, the nave of Durham, and in the magnificent national abbey of Westminster. In Belgium we find the church of St. Gudule, in Brussels and that of Dunes, built by four hundred monks in forty-eight years. In Spain are the beautiful cathedrals of Toledo, Burgos and Seville. The soil of Germany is dotted with Gothic monuments; Cologne stands complete after six hundred years, and forty cities gaze on the spire of Strasburg, that marvel on the Rhine; while Treves, Freiburg and Marburg are the admiration of the world. In Ireland "of the saints," the cathedrals have been stolen and the abbeys are in ruins. Athenry and Kilconnell, Mellifont and Dunbrodie, Holy Cross and Cashel uplift "their stately heads in ruined beauty over the land they once adorned," and their cloisters and their chapels are filled with the graves of the silent dead.

It is strange, yet it is true, that during three hundred years—from the Renaissance until some time during the last century—the prodigious manifestation of religious sentiment and ideas every-

where resplendent in the monuments of the Middle Ages, was really uncomprehended and apparently unknown. These were despised and ignored as relics of barbarism, whence the name "Gothic," a synonym of "barbaric." Voltaire, that prince of scoffers, did not hesitate to assert that, one hundred and fifty years before his time, there was not in all Europe a single monument of architecture worthy of attention.

But the clouds of ignorance, error and prejudice have long since rolled away; the name of reproach has become a glorious title, and men of genius have unfolded before us the incomparable beauties of Gothic art.

The Gothic cathedral has been admirably styled *la pensée chrétienne bâtie*—Christian thought architecturally expressed. And indeed, if we examine it in the light of its mystic meaning, we shall find that in it is recorded the complete history of religion, and the full teaching of its mysteries, a veritable *summa theologica* and historical epitome written in marble by the Christian generations of the Ages of Faith. Eternity and time, the spirit creation and the kingdoms of nature, both are there, two worlds in miniature.

The temple itself, constructed of many stones, some bearing and some borne, some both borne and bearing, some borne yet not bearing, some great and some small, some visible and some hidden, some near the corner-stone and the foundation and some far from both, some high and some low, but all united, all joined in closest union, all forming a compact whole, all resting on the foundation and the corner-stone—what is it but the mystic body of Jesus Christ formed from the members of the human family, joined to His sacred humanity by the sacrament of baptism, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone?" In Him "all the building being formed together groweth up into an holy temple of the Lord, in Whom you also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. II., 20, 21, 22.)

Within the sacred walls, human differences are forgotten; rank and age and wealth bend low the knee in unison with poverty and youth and lowliness; the stranger within the gates and the citizen of the realm together offer homage to Him who is equally their King. "For by Him we have access both in one spirit to the Father. Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners, but you are fellow-citizens with the saints and domestics of God." (*Ibid.* 18, 19.)

We are reconciled "to God in one body by the cross" (*Ibid.* 16), and the Gothic temple, in its divine geometry, represents the altar of the victim Who offered Himself to save the human race; the

nave, extending its two arms, is the Man-God on the cross, while the choir, inclined as compared with the nave, is His head bent down in agony.

In the midst of nature cursed in his fall, man drags out the weary length of his existence, drawing nigher and still more nigh to Him who made him, until, his day of pilgrimage over, he sinks to rest at last in the bosom of his God. Thus, too, in the Christian temple, we tread the "long-drawn aisle," now amid deepening gloom, again with painted rays across our pathway, until we reach the very extremity of the sacred edifice; and there we sink in prayer and adoration in the presence of Jesus Christ. For there, in the depths of the tabernacle, under the luminous cloud of the Eucharist, resides the God who fills the temple with the majesty of His presence; to that point converge all the lines as from it they have diverged: creation, emanating from its principle, returns to it again; man, fallen from grace, returns to God "through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Nature here dons the garb of art, and in it pays homage to "the Creator of heaven and earth." The vault above us unrolls in majesty like heaven's own blue arch, while the building itself stretches away in its vastness like the horizon of nature. Clustered columns, like the gnarled and knotted giants of the forest, lifting high their foliated heads, mingle with the tracery of the arches, and are crowned with sculptured flowers. Living creatures come forth in stone and bronze to people this forest of man's creation. The pavement is the sea, and from its bosom, like islands from the ocean, arise the many chapels, while in its waters mimic monsters of the deep disport themselves in glee.

As the sky bends down to meet the earth, so, too, heaven seems here to meet this "vale of tears." The happy spirits that people the blessed land hover over us with outstretched wings, or stand in seeming meditation in the Gothic niches and under the sculptured canopies. The saints of both Testaments shine in glory on the sun-lit windows, just as in the firmament of God's love they shine "as stars to all eternity." (Dan. xii., 3.) Mary, our mother, blessed by all generations, looks down on us with love, with an aspect calm and beautiful, with a virgin-mother's smile. And, at the extremity of the apsis, brightly crowned with gold mosaic, stands a colossal figure of Christ the Saviour and Supreme Judge, "a smile of mercy playing about the half-opened lips, the eyes soft, yet firm, and fixed as eternity."

No wonder is it, then, that Catholic worship and Christian art have ever exercised a powerful influence on the worshiper. Sometimes the heart stands still in awe; more often it overflows with love; nearly always it cannot give expression to its feelings. The

brilliant Lamartine, in language chaste, choice and eloquent, thus apostrophises the splendid churches which Christianity has given to us, where God is worshiped "in spirit and in truth," and true art has found its lasting habitation :

"Hail, sacred tabernacle, where thou, O Lord, dost descend at the voice of a mortal! Hail, mysterious altar, where faith comes to receive its immortal food! When the last hour of the day has groaned in thy solemn towers, when its last beam fades and dies away in the dome, when the widow, holding her child by the hand, has wept on the pavement and retraced her steps like a silent ghost, when the sigh of the distant organ seems lulled to rest with the day, to awaken again with the morning, when the nave is deserted and the Levite attentive to the lamps of the holy place with a slow step hardly crosses it again, then is the hour when I come to glide under thy obscure vault, and to seek, while nature sleeps, Him who aye watches! Ye columns who veil the sacred asylums where my eyes dare not penetrate, at the feet of your immovable trunks I come to sigh. Cast over me your deep shades; render the darkness more obscure, and the silence more profound! Forests of porphyry and marble, the air which the soul breathes under your arches is full of mystery and peace! Let love and anxious care seek shade and solitude under the green shelter of groves to soothe their secret wounds! O darkness of the sanctuary, the eye of religion prefers thee to the wood which the breeze disturbs. Nothing changes thy foliage; thy still shade is the image of motionless eternity! Eternal pillars, where are the hands that formed ye? Quarries, answer, where are they? Dust! The sport of the winds! Our hands, which carved the stone, turn to dust before it, and man is not jealous! He dies, but his holy thought animates the cold stone and rises to heaven with it. Forums, palaces, crumble to ashes; time casts them away with scorn; the foot of the traveller who tramples upon them lays bare their ruins; but when the block of stone leaves the side of the quarry and is carved for Thy temple, O Lord, it is Thine; Thy shadow imprints upon our work the sublime seal of Thine own immortality! . . . I love the obscurity of Thy temple; it is an island of peace in the ocean of the world, a beacon of immortality! Inhabited alone by Thee and by death, one hears from afar the flood of time which roars upon this border of eternity. It seems as if our voice, which only is lost in the air, concentrated in these walls by this narrow space, resounds better to our soul, and that the holy echo of Thy sonorous vault bears along with it the sigh which seeks Thee in its ascent to heaven, more fervent before it can evaporate!"—(Quoted by Digby, *Mores Catholici*.)

THE NORSE HIERARCHY OF AMERICA.

WE mentioned in this REVIEW last October that Greenland contained in the eastern settlement twelve churches, including a fine and massive cathedral, dedicated to St. Nicholas, at Gardar, the episcopal see; and in the western settlement four churches. The first bishop, Eric Upsi, bore the title of the Bishop of Greenland, and the episcopal residence is said to have been at Steinnes; the other Greenland bishops bore the title of Bishops of Gardar. We have no Bulls to show the first erection of an episcopal see in Greenland, nor the appointments of the earlist bishops, for it would seem from the documents which we have found extant that the metropolitans of those distant and northern nations, by long and recognized usage, and by the concurrence, permission or acquiescence of the Holy See, exercised the function of appointing bishops when needed in their provinces or jurisdictions. We will give the list and the histories of the Catholic bishops of Greenland as far as the materials within our reach will enable us to give details on this most interesting branch of our article,—the Ecclesiastical History of the Northmen in America, which we have endeavored now, for the first time, to treat as a separate subject.

I. Eric Gnipson, or Upsi, is mentioned in several of the ancient annals and Sagas as the first Bishop of Greenland, and it is alleged that he was appointed in 1112, but not consecrated, that he returned to Iceland in 1120, and afterwards went to Denmark, where he was consecrated, in Lund, by Archbishop Adzer. It is believed that he never returned to his duties in Greenland, but soon after went as a missionary bishop to Vinland, where he announced the Gospel and probably gave his life for the faith. During his residence in Greenland he is said to have resided at Steinnes. As the first settlement in Vinland by Leif Ericson was about the year 1000, and Bishop Eric's voyage to Vinland is placed in the year 1121, there is probability of a continuous settlement, or intercourse at least, of the Northmen with Vinland, covering this period of more than a century. Vinland is now recognized, without dissent among historians and geographers, as located in the southern part of Massachusetts, and embracing Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, and especially Rhode Island. Indeed, there is reason to believe that the Northmen from Norway, Iceland and Greenland made voyages to the coast of the mainland from Nova Scotia to Vinland from 1121 to 1357, and perhaps longer, for in the *Antiquitates Americanæ* Professor Rafn gives from various an-

cient and authentic Icelandic works several passages which show this fact, of which we transcribe several: "1121. Eric, Bishop of Greenland, went to search out Vinland." "Bishop Eric Upse sought Vinland." "1285. A new land is discovered west from Iceland." "New land is found." "Adalbrand and Thorvald, the sons of Helge, found the new land." "Adalbrand and Thorwald found new land west of Iceland." "The Feather Islands are discovered." "1288. Rolf is sent by King Eric to search out the new land and called on people of Iceland to go with him." "1289. King Eric sends Rolf to Iceland to seek out the new land." "1290. Rolf travelled through Iceland, and called out men for a voyage to the new land." "1295. Landa Rolf died." "1355." "There came likewise a ship from Greenland, smaller than the smallest of Iceland ships, that came in the outer bay. It had lost its anchor. There were seventeen men on board, who had gone to Markland (Nova Scotia), and on their return were drifted here. But here, altogether, that winter were eighteen large ships, besides the two that were wrecked in the summer. There came a ship from Greenland that had sailed to Markland, and there were eight men on board."

Crantz says: "He (Bishop Eric) was never regularly ordained a bishop and had no Episcopal seat, but principally travelled around the country to edify the churches, and at length went over to Wine-land to convert the heathen there." This same historian is of the opinion that from the time of the unfortunate expedition of Helgo and Finbog, with the Amazon Freydis, in 1110 and 1113, to the time of Bishop Eric, there remained Greenland colonists at Vinland, for he says: "We have at least from that time no accounts of that colony, except that one hundred years after the discovery of the country, Eric, a Greenland bishop, is said to have gone thither to convert his forlorn countrymen. The remaining colonists probably had fled, and dispersed themselves over the country for fear of punishment. From these outcasts are probably descended the present Indians in the neighborhood of New Foundland, who are so strikingly distinguished in their person and mode of life from other Americans."

II. The Sage Einar Sokkeson gives an account of the second Greenland bishop, Arnold, who was the first to bear the title of Bishop of Gardar. In 1123 Sokke Thorerson, who lived at Brattahlid, in Greenland, called together his neighbors, the Greenland colonists, he being recognized by them as a man of great influence and authority, and he said to them that so large and flourishing a colony as Greenland, where, too, there were so many Christians, should be provided with a bishop and an Episcopal see. As the colonists were all in favor of this important step, and were

willing to support a bishop and maintain him in his authority, they all agreed in selecting Einar, the son of Sokke, to proceed to Norway and carry their petition for the appointment of a bishop. We prefer here to give the language of the Saga itself in relation to the mission of Einar, and the appointment of the first Bishop of Gardar :

“ Einar took with him in his ship many walrus teeth and costly skins to gain the good will of the Norway court. They came to Norway, and there was Sigurd Jorsalafarer, king of that country. Einar sought the king and was well received by him, and he detailed to him his errand, and besought the king's powerful aid for that of which the land he had left was sorely in need. The king deemed that it would greatly benefit the land, and he called unto him a man named Arnold, a learned clerk, and one well versed in the history of the people. The king besought Arnold to undertake this heavy task, for God's sake and for his (the king's) own sake, and I shall send thee, quoth he, to Archbishop Ossur, in Lund, with my sealed letters. Arnold answered that he had little wish to accept the proffered task for various reasons ; and first, on his own account, for that he was ill fitted thereunto ; and secondly, that he must leave behind him all his friends and relatives forever ; and lastly, that he would have a wild and savage people to govern. The king replied that the greater the evils he endured from men the more glorious would be his reward in heaven. Arnold answered, that he would not refuse the king's prayer, ‘ but,’ quoth he, “ I insist on this, that Einar shall swear to me an oath to defend all the rights and privileges of the future bishop's see.’ And to this Einar agreed. Therefore Arnold proceeded to Archbishop Ossur, and told him his errand, and showed to him the king's letters. The Archbishop received him well, and examined closely his spiritual and moral character, and being convinced that this man was well fitted for so high a dignity, he consecrated him bishop.”

Now the Saga relates that Bishop Arnold, forced by stress of weather, on his voyage to Greenland, to land in Iceland, passed the winter at Oddé with Saemund the learned (an ecclesiastic of the Church of Iceland), and then relates the following occurrence :

“ It is told that as the bishop and his men rode up to Oddé from the ship, they stopped to rest their horses at a bonder's house in Laudey, and they themselves sat before the door. An old woman came out of the house with a card for teasing wool, and going up to one of the strangers, she said, ‘ Wilt thou, my brother, fasten this tooth to my card?’ And the stranger readily agreed to do so, and taking a hammer out of his haversack, he fastened the tooth in the card, so that the old woman was well pleased therewith.

And the stranger was Bishop Arnold himself, who was skilful in such handiwork, and the story was told thereafter as an instance of his humility."

The consecration of Bishop Arnold having taken place in 1128, the bishop and his retinue arrived in Greenland in the following summer, and he then took possession of his Episcopal see of Gardar. The location of Gardar in Greenland is not certain. The principal Greenland settlement was on the west coast, and what was known as the eastern Bygd or settlement did not extend farther than the southern extremity towards Cape Farewell. The eastern coast of Greenland was not settled, and the eastern Bygd should rather have been called the southern Bygd. The western and southern coasts were the seats of the two settlements. As Bishop Arnold remained twenty years in Greenland, the erection of the Cathedral of Gardar, of many of the sixteen churches we have mentioned, and the endowment of the Episcopal see with its rich revenues, must have chiefly been accomplished during his administration, for the Church of Greenland became richly endowed for so poor a country. Several small islands and fiörds and their fisheries belonged to the Bishops of Gardar, and no one could fish therein without the bishop's permission. Also besides his Episcopal residence, the Bishop of Gardar had several villas, to one of which the old annals apply the word "*magnifica*," and of another it was said that it was "a house worthy of a king."

It happened that the bishop's ship on the voyage from Norway to Greenland was accompanied by a Norwegian named Arnbjörn with his ship, also, and crew; but the two ships were separated by storms on the ocean and Arnbjörn and his ship and crew were believed to have been wrecked, for when the bishop arrived at Greenland, Arnbjörn had not arrived, and his fate was not ascertained until four years afterwards. In 1130, after four years, a Greenland, named Sigurd Nialson, went on a fishing voyage as far as Cape Farewell. Meeting with but little success, he and his companions concluded to explore some of the unknown fiörds of the east coast, and in one of these distant inlets they saw a large ship stranded there at the mouth of a river, and a small bark near by. The ship was large, had carved figures on it, was well painted and well equipped for the ocean. On landing they saw a large hut, and a tent not far from it, and on repeating their visit to the shore next morning they saw first a piece of timber with an axe sticking in it, and close beside it lay the body of a dead man. Proceeding cautiously, they soon saw another dead body, and then approaching the tent they raised the roof off, in order to allow the escape of the noxious vapors from the dead bodies they expected to find therein, and there they found the corpses of Arnbjörn and his

companions, and a considerable quantity of goods. Placing all the dead bodies in a caldron, so as to remove the flesh from the bones, the skeletons and all the goods were placed in the ship, for it was the intention of Sigurd to carry the bodies to the bishop for interment at the church; the ship he intended to present also to the Church for the souls of the dead, and the goods were divided among the captain and the sailors, according to the laws of Greenland. The bishop accepted the fine ship for the Church and buried the dead. The sequel of this story was unfortunate for the Greenland Church and colony, and not creditable to the memory and character of Bishop Arnold. The relatives of the shipwrecked Arnbjörn in Norway, having received the news that his ship had been found, that his fate had been ascertained, and his body recovered and buried at the church, came to Greenland the following year, 1131, and claimed as their property, by legal succession, his ship and its contents. Bishop Arnold refused their demand, alleging that the goods had been disposed of according to the laws of Greenland, and that they were at all events the property of Arnbjörn and could not be more appropriately disposed of than for the benefit of the souls of the late owners. Ossur, the principal relative of the deceased and shipwrecked Arnbjörn, incensed at the bishop's refusal, left his presence with threats of revenge. This misunderstanding continued through the winter. Ossur appealed to the Althing, or court of justice, held by the assembled people, and failed to get a hearing, and through revenge cut two planks from the side of the vessel. Bishop Arnold did not disguise his rage at this act; he sent for Einar, reminded him of his oath in Norway to defend the rights and emoluments of the Church, observed that Ossur had forfeited his life for the injury he had done to the ship, and that he would hold Einar as a perjured man if nothing was now done. We will here give the narrative of this unfortunate transaction in the language of the Saga itself:

"Thereafter the people collected to the feast of the consecration of a church, and to a banquet at Langenæs. The bishop and Einar were there, and many others, and the bishop himself sang Mass. Thither, likewise, had Ossur come, and he stood against the south wall of the church conversing with a man named Brand Thordarson, who dwelt with the bishop. Brand besought Ossur to yield to the prelate; but Ossur replied that he could not bend himself thereto, so ill had he been treated, and they were deep in converse together as the bishop left the church; and Einar was with him, and they both moved towards the house. When they came to the entrance of the great chamber, Einar turned suddenly back from the crowd, and returning alone to the churchyard took an axe from the hand of a man who had come to attend Mass, and proceeded

to the south side of the building. Ossur stood there leaning upon his axe. Einar struck him straightways a fatal blow, and then went back to the house, where the feast was ready, and he went up to the table opposite to the bishop, but spoke no words. Then came in Brand Thordarson, and went up to the bishop and said: 'Hast thou heard aught new, my lord?' The bishop replied: 'I have heard nothing, but hast thou?' 'There is one that hast fallen outside and needs thy blessing,' quoth Brand. 'Who hath done this?' cried the bishop, 'and to whom?' Brand answered that they were near him who could tell all. 'Hast thou, Einar, caused the death of Ossur?' demanded Arnold. He answered: 'Truly I did so.' The bishop observed: 'Such deeds are indeed evil, but this one may be excused.' Brand then besought that the body might be washed, and might have Christian burial, but the bishop said there was time enough for that. They still continued at table, and heeded little more of the matter, nor would the bishop give orders for singing over the dead body till Einar himself begged that it might be done. Then the bishop said: 'It were but just that Ossur's body should not be buried near the church, but for thy prayer, Einar, he shall be buried near unto this church of Langenæs, for it has no priest attached to it.'"

A Catholic and judicious writer in the *Dublin Review* of September, 1849, says: "The sequel of this history by no means redounds to Bishop Arnold's praise. This prelate seems to have been not only grasping and avaricious, but even to have been a consenting party to a foul murder committed by his friend Einar." And again: "The ruins of the church of Langenæs, near the head of the present fiörd of Igaliko, have not yet been carefully cleared. Well might the curse of God fall upon the colony of Greenland when such fearful assassinations were countenanced by the unworthy prelate Arnold. Let us not, however, judge too hastily of this man, for it is possible that the history of Einar Sokkeson may have been written by one of the opposite party, who, of course, would spare no efforts to blacken the memory of the bishop. Einar Sokkeson was subsequently murdered by Ossur's friends, and a long and bloody feud continued for some time between the parties."

The following continuation of the account of this disgraceful affair, which further illustrates the appalling trials of the early Church in her efforts to carry Christianity to the pagan nations of the north, is from Crantz's "History of Greenland": "Some time afterwards, Ausur, the nephew of the unfortunate Arnbjörn, came to Greenland, and demanded his uncle's effects. Einar, who had promised to defend the claims of the church, refused his demand in an assembly of the people. The exasperated Ausur secretly

destroyed the disputed ship, and repairing to the western coast met with two merchant vessels, whose crews he prevailed upon to lend him their assistance, and revenge still further the injury offered in his person to all Norwegian subjects. On his return to Gardar, Einar, piqued by a reproof from the bishop for suffering the property of the church to be damaged contrary to his oath, treacherously slew him with an axe in the churchyard, as they were returning together from divine service. His comrades immediately rose to revenge his death. Old Sok (father of Einar) vainly attempted to compromise the matter in the general assembly by the offer of a trifling pecuniary compensation for the blood of their leader, and they murdered his son Einar on the spot. A confused affray instantly arose, in which several lives were lost on both sides. Sok proposed to attack the three ships, but was persuaded by a discreet old farmer to lay aside his purpose and enter into a treaty with the murderers of his son. Ausur's party having lost one man more than their adversaries, Sok paid a sum of money to make up the difference on condition that the intruders should immediately weigh anchor and leave the country to return no more. The story is told at length by Torfæus, but this brief abstract will be sufficient to illustrate the manners and government of the old Norwegians in Greenland." It is impossible to suppose that a word from Bishop Arnold, who had in fact been the guilty instigator of the feud from the beginning, would not at least have quieted the affair, and prevented further bloodshed and violence. But we do not find any account of his having exercised the ministry of peace among these barbarous and newly converted members of his flock on this fatal occasion, and from all accounts he insisted to the last on holding the ship, even at the cost of several human lives.

Bishop Arnold continued to reside in Greenland for twenty years altogether, and must have erected many of its churches. The blood of Ossur never ceased to cry out against him. He finally returned to Norway, where he died, after having been, according to Crantz, Bishop of Hammer in that country.

III. John Knutus, or Kutus, became Bishop of Gardar in 1150, and is mentioned by Crantz as Jonas I. He was probably an Icelander. The only further mention we find made of this prelate is in the Saga of Bishop Paul, of Skalholt, in Iceland, where it is said he assisted that prelate, in 1186, in blessing the holy oils at Easter. But it is quite probable that he never returned to Greenland, for his successor was Bishop of Gardar in 1188. Father Moosmuller says that he was consecrated at Drontheim, but assigns him to a later date, 1204.

The Saga, whose words also show the antiquity of the custom of blessing the holy oils on Holy Thursday, says:

"In Bishop Paul's days came Bishop John from Greenland, and he staid for the winter in the East fiörd in Iceland. But in the time of the long fast (Lent) he travelled to Skalholt, there to meet with Bishop Paul, and he arrived there on Maunday Thursday, and the two bishops consecrated on that day much holy chrism, and had together many learned and confidential conversations."

IV. John II. We know nothing of this bishop but the date of his appointment and consecration in 1188, in which year we find from the ecclesiastical annals of the archdiocese of Drontheim that Eric was archbishop, by whom Bishop John II. must have been consecrated.

V. Helgius became Bishop of Gardar in 1212, and was consecrated by Archbishop Thor I., of Drontheim. He died in 1230.

VI. Nicholas became Bishop of Gardar in 1234, and was consecrated by Thor II., Archbishop of Drontheim. He died in Greenland in 1240.

VII. Olaf became Bishop of Gardar in 1246, and was consecrated by Sigvard, Archbishop of Drontheim. Under this bishop three Greenland deputies, Odd, Paul and Leif, were sent to the court of Norway, either to make peace or to offer their allegiance to the crown. He also assisted at the consecration of Gellius, Archbishop of Drontheim, in 1256. This was ten years after his own consecration, and shows the intercourse between Greenland and Norway, and between the bishops of Greenland and their metropolitans. It may also suggest a probable custom of paying a decennial visit by suffragans to their metropolitans, as the ecclesiastical law now requires from all bishops a decennial visit to Rome. Bishop Olaf was charged by the Court of Norway with the important mission of uniting to the crown the Scandinavian establishments beyond the seas, and he availed himself of the opportunity of preaching the crusades and promoting the interests of the Church in the recovery of the tomb of Jesus Christ.

In 1271 the Holy See resolved to ask the Peter-Pence from the distant flocks of Greenland, and by letters of December 4th, 1276, John XX. authorized Archbishop John II. of Drontheim, on account of the length of the voyage, not to make the voyage to Greenland in person for this purpose. In 1279 Archbishop John availed himself of a vessel about to sail to America to send "a wise and discreet person" to collect in his name the *tithes* and the products of the communes "taken of vows, as well in the diocese of Gardar as in the islands and neighboring territories"; which last words may have alluded to the Church of Vinland in our own country. By letter dated at Rome, January 31st, 1279, Pope Nicholas III. confirmed the plenary powers given by the archbishop to this collector of the Papal revenues, whose name is not now known. Three years later

this "wise and discreet person" returned to Norway with a cargo of walrus teeth, whale bones and furs. The American colonists in that remote year, 1283, probably possessed none of the precious metals, and the currency of the country must have been chiefly the ivory and furs of the north. But they responded to the call of the Holy Father, and practically said: "Gold and silver we have none, but such as we have we will give unto thee." The Archbishop of Drontheim was embarrassed by this novel method of paying the Peter-Pence, and on his requesting instructions from Rome, he was directed to sell the walrus teeth, whale bones and furs for the Church.

VIII. Thorder or Theodore, consecrated in 1288 by Jorunder, Archbishop of Drontheim; he died in Greenland in 1313. During his administration, in 1307, the tithes of Greenland and Vinland figured again in the collections of the Peter-Pence.

IX. Arnius or Arno, was consecrated in 1314 by Eilegh, Archbishop of Drontheim, and arrived in Greenland in 1315. Gravier mentions that the fate of this bishop is buried in obscurity, for his successor was appointed in the absence of any knowledge of his fate. The Council of Vienne, having levied subsidies for the Peter-Pence, Arnius, Bishop of Gardar, who had arrived in Greenland in 1315, caused the Papal contributions to be collected in the ivory and furs of the country and sent them to Europe. In 1325 the American merchandise thus sent was sold to the Flemming, Jean du Pré, and the proceeds amounted to 12 livres and 40 sols of Turin currency.

X. John Calvus, 1343, consecrated by Olaf I., Archbishop of Drontheim.

XI. Alfus or Alfo, consecrated in 1376, by Winold, Archbishop of Drontheim, and died in 1378. It was during this bishop's administration that the Skraelings, or savages of the country, who had been seen on the coasts of New England by Leif, Thorfinn, and the other Vikings in the beginning of the eleventh century, now made their first appearance in Greenland; an important fact, showing that the Esquimaux came from the south and from our own country to Greenland. Their appearance in Greenland was a sad omen for the colony, for they finally exterminated the Norse settlements.

So much had the intercourse with Greenland declined that in 1383, six years after the death of Bishop Alfus, we find the following curious entry in the ancient Icelandic annals:

"A ship came from Greenland to Norway, which had lain in the former country two whole years; and certain men returned by this vessel who had escaped from the wreck of Thorlak's ship. These men brought the news of Bishop Alf's death from Greenland, which had taken place there six years before."

The Greenland colonists were now, no doubt, suffering terrible disasters from the attacks of the Esquimaux and from the ravages of disease.

Between Alphus and Henry, we have the names of four bishops of Gardar, but only their names, as follows :

XII. Berthold.

XIII. Gregory.

XIV. Andrew.

XV. John.

XVI. Henry, who was consecrated in 1389 by Winold, Archbishop of Drontheim. His Episcopal seal has been found and published by the Society of Northern Antiquarians. Although this prelate was consecrated in 1389, he must have been preconised in 1386 or earlier, for he is said to have been present in 1386 at the assembly of the nobles convoked by King Olaus, at Nyburg, in Fünen, where he and other bishops procured various immunities for the churches and convents. Bishop Henry is known to have been residing in Greenland in 1391, but his final fate is still unknown. It is related that in 1388 Bishop Hendrick from one of the sees of Norway went to Greenland, probably to see to the collection of the royal dues and the Peter-Pence, for he had orders to see that the former were deposited in some safe place, as there was no ship passing between the countries.

XVII. No tidings having been received of Bishop Henry for many years, Archbishop Askill, of Drontheim, in 1406, consecrated Andreas or Endride Andreasson as Bishop of Gardar, "but whether he ever reached Greenland was unknown," as Mr. Beamish writes, "until Prof. Finn Magnusen, a few years since, states that three years subsequent to that period, namely in 1409, he filled the office at the Episcopal seat at Gardar, and there prepared, or was a party to, the contract of a marriage, from which the learned Runologist himself, as well as many other distinguished Icelanders, owe their descent."

XVIII. James became Bishop of Gardar in 1417, and was ordained by Eschillus, Archbishop of Drontheim. His Episcopal seal has been recovered and published by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquarians at Copenhagen; it bears the legend: "S. Jacobi Dei gra. epi. Garden.," which may be thus translated: *The seal of James, by grace of God, Bishop of Gardar.* Gravier states that in 1418 Greenland was paying annually to the Holy See, under the head of tithes and Peter-Pence, 2600 livres in the walrus teeth, and gives Malte Brun and Dr. Kohl as his authorities for the statement.

XIX. In 1433, Pope Eugenius IV. nominated one Bartholomæus as Bishop of Gardar. It is also mentioned by Crantz that

the Bishop of Roeskilde subscribed himself Bishop of Greenland in 1533.

Henceforth Christian Greenland and her forlorn colonies seem almost to disappear from the sight and the memory of the rest of Christendom.

But the Father of all the faithful at Rome did not lose sight of the Christians in Greenland, for there has been found in the archives of the Vatican a remarkable brief of Pope Nicholas V. to the Bishops of Skalholt and Holum, in Iceland, written in the year 1448, in which, with paternal sympathy, he deploras the sad condition and the impending fate of his beloved Catholic children in this western world :

“ With reference to my beloved children, who are natives of and dwell in the great island of Greenland, which is said to lie on the extremest boundaries of the ocean, northwards of the Kingdom of Norway, and in the district of Throndjem, have by their pitiful complaints greatly moved my ear, and awakened our sympathy, seeing that the inhabitants, for almost six hundred years, have held the Christian faith, which by the teaching of their first instructor, King Olaf, was established amongst them, firm and immovable under the Roman See, and the Apostolic forms ; and seeing that in after years, from the constant and ardent zeal of the inhabitants of the said island, many sacred buildings, and a handsome Cathedral, have been erected on this island, in which the service of God was diligently performed, until heathen foreigners from the neighboring coast, thirty years since, came with a fleet against them, and fell with fury upon all the people who dwelt there, and laid waste the land itself and the holy buildings with fire and sword, without leaving upon the island of Greenland other than the few people who are said to be far off, and which they, by reason of high mountains, could not reach, and took off the much-to-be commiserated inhabitants of both sexes, particularly those whom they looked upon as convenient and strong enough for the constant burden of slavery, and took home with them those against whom they could best direct their barbarity. But now since the same complaint further saith that many, in the course of time, have come back from said captivity, and after having here and there rebuilt the devastated places, now wish to have the worship of their God again established, and set upon the former footing ; and since they, in consequence of the before-named pressing calamity, wanting the necessary means themselves, have hitherto not had the power to support their priesthood and superiors, therefore, during all that period of thirty years, have been in want of the consolations of the bishops, and the services of the priests, except when some one, through desire of the service of God, has been willing to undertake tedious and toilsome journeys to the people

whom the fury of the barbarians has spared,—seeing that we have a complete knowledge of all these things, so do we now charge and direct ye brethren, who, we are informed, are the nearest bishops to the said island, that ye, after first conferring with the chief bishop of the diocese, if the distance of the place allows of it, to nominate and send them a fit and proper man as bishop.”

In the year 1520 the famous Eric Walkendorf, the last Catholic Archbishop of Drontheim, made great efforts to collect information of the long unheard from see of Gardar, with the view of renewing intercourse between it and his metropolitan see. But the direful advance of the so-called Lutheran Reformation put an end to his noble efforts.

Of the priests engaged on the Greenland missions from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries we have but little information ; some conjectures might be formed as to their numbers from the number of churches in the colonies. In two cases only we have found the mention of priests by their names. In the year 1188, the priest Ingemund, who had arrived the year before in Norway from England, sailed for Eric's fiörd in Greenland. No tidings of his arrival in Greenland were ever received, but fourteen years after the ship in which this zealous priest from Catholic England went on his heroic apostolate was found in an uninhabited part of the country, probably on the east coast, and beside the ship lay the corpses of Ingemund and his six companions in a cleft in the rock. Let the ancient Saga speak of this touching incident, in which God rewarded in this world even the faith and charity of this martyr to religion.

“ Among these was the priest Ingemund, his body was whole and entire (after fourteen years), but the skeletons of the six men lay around him. Wax was also at his side (probably a waxen tablet), and Runes thereon, telling of their hard fate and approaching death. But it seemed to men a great sign that God had been so well contented with the priest Ingemund's life and conversation, that his body should have so long lain uncorrupted.”

In 1266 three priests of the diocese of Gardar made an expedition to the Arctic regions, and penetrated Barrow's Strait and the Wellington Canal. They went upon this brave and perilous voyage in the interests of discovery and science ; their recorded observations give the declination of the sun and the obliquity of the ecliptic, and they penetrated nearly as far towards the North Pole as the vaunted scientific expeditions of our own day, for they reached the 75th degree of north latitude. They returned safely back to Gardar aided by the polar current.

It is also stated that two Greenland priests, Adalbrand and

Thorwald Helgason, in 1285, discovered a new land, which was afterwards identified as Newfoundland.

Mention having been made of the monasteries and convents of Greenland, we would wish to give interested readers all we know on this fascinating subject, but we must now, for want of space, confine ourselves to the description of the most famous one, the Dominican convent of St. Thomas, the description of which we will give in the language of Father Kircher, taken by him from the narrative of Nicholas Zeno, a Venetian sea captain, in the service of the king of Denmark, who was driven by stress of weather on the coast of Greenland, in 1380, and saw this mediæval convent, in the western world, which, wonderful as it may seem, in its mechanical and scientific appliances and developments, far exceeded the most elegant *apartments* of our own day and country, even though they be supplied with "all the modern improvements and conveniences." Father Kircher's description reads:

"Here is also a Dominican convent to be seen, dedicated to St. Thomas, in whose neighborhood there is a volcano that vomits forth fire, and at the foot thereof is a well of burning hot water. This hot water is not only conveyed by pipes into the convent, and through all the cells of the friars, to keep them warm, as with us the rooms are heated with stoves of fire-wood or other fuel, but here they also boil and bake their meat and bread with the same. This volcano, or fiery mountain, throws out such a quantity of pumice-stone (lava?) that it had furnished materials for the construction of the whole convent. There are also fine gardens, which reap great benefit from this hot water, adorned with all sorts of flowers and full of fruit. And after the river has watered these gardens, it empties itself into the adjoining bay, which causes it never to freeze, and great numbers of fish and sea-fowl flock thither, which yield plentiful provision for their nourishment."

This account of St. Thomas' Convent, marvellous as it may appear, was singularly confirmed by a friar, a native of Greenland, who spent his youth in this convent, but returned and spent the remainder of his life in Iceland, about the middle of the sixteenth century. Two different authorities received the story from the lips of the Icelandic friar, and they have transmitted it to us, in confirmation of the account of Nicholas Zeno, given by Father Kircher and other authors. Our Patent Office contains many patented inventions for heating houses and cooking food with steam and hot water, and for raising fruits and flowers by the same means, and we see them in our daily use; does not the prior invention of the Dominican monks of Greenland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries rob these modern inventors of their claim to originality? Familiar as we are with the present applications of

steam and hot water, the foregoing account of the Convent of St. Thomas must seem freed from all difficulties of belief, but the story, though well authenticated and received by the learned, was regarded as marvellous and bordering on the exaggerated by the people of a half century ago.

Crantz in his "History of Greenland" says: "A German author, Dethmar Blefken, tells us that, being in Iceland, in 1546, he met with a Dominican monk from the monastery of St. Thomas in Greenland, who, having in the preceding year accompanied his bishop from that country to Norway, had finally settled in Iceland. From this monk he professes to have received a description of the monastery; and though the incoherence of his account makes it appear questionable (Crantz had not lived to see the uses to which steam and hot water are applied in our day, for he wrote nearly three quarters of a century ago), I find it confirmed by Cæsar Longinus. He mentions that James Hall, an Englishman, who made many voyages to Iceland and Greenland in the Danish service, and gave a most detailed and faithful account of the Greenlanders, likewise conversed with the same monk in the presence of the governor of Iceland. To this person, also, he gave an account of his convent, stating 'that it contained a well of hot water, which, being conducted in pipes through all the apartments, warmed not only them, but also the chambers of the upper story; that meat was boiled over this spring as quickly as over a fire; that the walls of the convent were composed of pumice stone; and that hot water poured upon stones of this substance reduced them to the consistency of clay, so that they could be used for mortar.' " . . . "We meet with a similar notice of this convent in the Danish Chronicle, with the addition of a garden, which, being irrigated by a tepid rivulet, produced the most luxuriant flowers and fruits."

Our notice of the churches of Greenland must be brief. 1st. In Herjulsnes was situated the church of Herjulsfjörd. 2d. The second church was at Vatsdol in Ketilsfjörd. 3. The church at Vika, also in Ketilsfjörd. 4th. The church at Vog in Siglufjörd. 5th. The church below Höfdes at Vestfjörd. 6th. The cathedral church of Gardar at Einarsfjörd. 7th. The church at Hardsleinaberg. 8. The church of Brattahlid in Einarstfjörd. 9th. The church below Solarfjall at Isafjord. 10th. A church located at the same place as the 9th. 11th. The church at Hoalseyarsfjörd. 12th. The church of Gardanes. Such were the churches of the eastern or southern province. Those of the western province were: 1st. The church of Sandres in Lysufjörd. 2d. The church at Hopi in Agnafjörd. 3d. The church of Anvida in Rangafjörd. The church at Ketilsfjörd was dedicated to the Holy Cross, and was popularly called Avos. The church at Nadsdal was dedicated under the patronage

of St. Peter. Father Moosmuller also here speaks of another monastery of Regular Deans (Canonici Regulares), whose founder was St. Chrodogang, Bishop of Metz. At Rafnsfjörð is also said to have stood in the inner part of the bay the monastery of the Benedictine nuns. The church of Vog in Siglufjörð was dedicated under the patronage of the sainted King Olaf. At Vas, the king's villa, between Einarsfjörð and Rafnsfjörð, stood the splendid cathedral of St. Nicholas.

The ruins of the cathedral church, which are described by geographers as situated in the background of the Bay of Igalico, have been discovered and cleared off in modern times. The building is one hundred and twenty feet long and one hundred feet wide, and the walls are six feet and over in width. The discovery of the ruins of this great church, which is near Igelikofjord, has enabled us to place the location of Gardar, the Episcopal see. Near the ruins were also discovered relics, crosses, and engraved stones. This, no doubt, is the same cathedral church mentioned by Pope Nicholas V. in his brief above quoted. This church is cruciform, and close to the east wall of the south transept was found the celebrated stone with the Runic inscription: "Vigdis, the daughter of Mars, lies here; God rejoice her soul."

The church of Kakortok is the best preserved of all the ecclesiastical ruins of ancient Greenland that have been found; we will describe it—would that time and space permitted us to devote more attention to the archæological remains of this interesting country. While in one place we find an inscription, "Here lies . . . ; God rest her soul," in another we find the touching prayer to the Blessed Virgin, so beautifully expressed in the old Norse language, and beautiful in every tongue, "*Mary mine, pray for me.*" And so we could proceed to draw from the relics of an extinct Christian race in inscriptions, crosses, baptisteries, and churches, the pious teachings of a devotional faith. But we must hasten to a conclusion.

The church of Kakortok is located in Kakortok fjörð, near the modern Danish colony of Julianehaab; is built in a plain, on the bank of the fjörð, at the foot of a hill whose beds of stone must have supplied the material for the church. The stones are massive, are carefully put together, and while the mortar is slightly visible on the inside of the walls, the outside appears to have been hewn over so as scarcely to show any seams. The orientation of the church is perfect. There are four windows and two doors on the south side looking to the sea, and the most eastern door of these is nearly eighteen inches lower than the others, and is believed to have been the door for the entrance of the priests and their attendants. On the north side there is but one window now

seen, the wall being greatly broken down where the other would have been. The principal entrance was, no doubt, in the western wall, over which is a large window; and in the eastern wall, at the same elevation, is another window, handsomely and correctly arched. The eastern wall is still nearly twenty feet high. There are several small niches, about five feet from the ground, in the interior of the church, and which it is believed were intended to hold the images of the saints; the north wall possessing three such niches, the south wall four. Its length is fifty-two feet, its breadth is twenty-six feet. The north and south walls are about four feet thick, while the east and west walls are nearly five. The arched window on the east end is, on the outside, three feet ten inches high, and two feet two inches broad; while on the inside it is five feet six inches high and four feet five inches broad. A wall extending around the whole building, at the distance of twenty-one to twenty-six feet, is quite dilapidated. The whole interior of the church and part of the church-yard have been excavated. It is generally believed that this was the last church built by the Greenlanders, and that it was the last they abandoned.

We have noticed already the decline of commerce, and even of communication, between Greenland and the mother countries. The fate of the last three bishops of Greenland, Henry, Andrew, and Bartholomew, is still unknown. Reduced in numbers by the fierce assaults of the Esquimaux, and by the ravages of pestilence, the Norwegian Greenlanders retired from one settlement after another. In 1348 a pestilence called the Black Death desolated Europe, and is believed to have reached the European colonies of Greenland, and it is thought it swept away one-half the population of Greenland. About the same time the western settlement was repeatedly attacked by the Esquimaux, and by the time their countrymen from the eastern settlement came to their assistance they found the settlements completely destroyed. The inhabitants had been slaughtered or carried off by disease, the villages had disappeared, and naught remained but a few of the domestic cattle roaming wildly and mournfully in the open country. The resources of the country had been exhausted by taxes levied to sustain the royal household of the kings of Norway. Queen Margaret sent an expedition for the relief of her perishing subjects, at the request of Bishop Henry, but as no tidings were ever received of these vessels, it is believed they must have all perished. Political cares and agitation, the remoteness of the country, and the perils of the voyage, caused Greenland to be forgotten and neglected. The eastern settlement lingered on for two centuries after the western settlement was destroyed. Here, too, town after town was abandoned;

some unusual blockade of ice prevented the remnant of the colonists from escaping to Europe; and finally, pressed by the Esquimaux and exhausted, the remaining colonists clustered around the church of Katortok, and when attacked by the unrelenting Esquimaux, again and again took refuge in the sacred edifice. Here dwelt the leader of the forlorn band, called by some Ungertok, and by others Olavik, perhaps Olaf.

The sad story of the final extermination of this forlorn remnant of an intrepid race of Christian warriors and sea-kings is thus told: The two hostile races lived almost face to face, inimical to each other, and yet the weaker party cautiously abstained from giving cause of offence to their more powerful and more numerous enemies. A Norwegian boy's imprudence was the immediate cause of an outbreak, and of the extermination of his race. One day, an Esquimau from the neighboring island of Akpeitevik rowed out towards the church of Kakortok to try some new arrows which he had just made. As he was passing a small point near the present ruins of the church, a small boy of the Norse colony, who sat there, ridiculed the Esquimau on the unskilful way in which he used his weapons. Imitating the cry of a bird, the boy dared the savage to hit him with his arrows. The Esquimau was enraged at the youthful taunts, and in an instant the boy lay pierced fatally with arrows. Soon, another Norseman fell in the same way. Ungertok, the last of the Norse leaders in Greenland, in turn became enraged, and he resolved to take a signal vengeance on his savage neighbors. On a moonlight night, he and his Norse companions climbed to the top of a high and steep hill behind Kakortok, with the intention of rushing suddenly down upon the Esquimaux and slaughtering them all in their sleep. But as they passed along the lake near the huts, a young Esquimau girl, who had gone out to fetch some water, saw their long shadows reflected on the still surface of the lake, and gave the alarm. The Esquimaux men, rushing from their huts, escaped, but the women and children were mercilessly massacred, except a little boy, who hid himself in the tumult in the cleft of a rock, which the Esquimaux point out to this day. While Ungertok's vengeance was but partially satisfied, the Esquimaux resolved on revenge. During the winter the men prepared a great supply of bows and arrows, while the women dressed a quantity of white seal skins for covering their boats. On the return of spring the Esquimaux, availing themselves of a favorable wind, rowed from Marksak round the shore where now stands the modern Danish colony of Julianshope. Arrived at the entrance to the Kakortok fjörd, they rested on their oars and allowed the boats to drive before the wind down upon the dwellings of the Norsemen. The latter rushed from their houses,

ranged themselves on the shore, and shielding their eyes, gazed eagerly out into the fjörd. Deceived by the white seal skins, which looked like pieces of drift-ice, their suspicions were calmed, and they returned into their dwellings. At nightfall, the Esquimaux landed a few bow-shots from the church, where the stone is still covered with dwarf wood, and stealing up to the doors fastened them securely, and then fired the buildings. All the Norsemen were consumed in the flames, except the chief Ungertok, who, with his infant son under his arm, sprang through one of the windows of the burning church and fled to the eastward. Closely pursued by numerous enemies, at first Ungertok made such speed that most of his pursuers dropped off, but when those that kept up the pursuit were pressing and gaining on him, he lightened himself of his burden by throwing his son into the lake, and then succeeded in making his escape to Igaliko. His enemies, however, still pursued him, and he wandered as best he could towards the south, in hopes of sighting a chance vessel that might carry him to the mother countries. His enemies succeeded finally in discovering him, and set upon him again. His immense strength and resolute courage kept his enemies at bay, while he defended himself desperately with an axe. Finally, an Esquimaux is said to have killed him with "a charmed arrow, formed of the terminating process of the back-bone of a barren woman."

The paternal voice of Pope Nicholas V., raised in pity for this distant and perishing western flock, in 1448, had died away, and within a century thereafter, and perhaps while the last of the Catholic archbishops of Trondjeim was struggling to send them relief, the last of the Catholic Greenlander-Norsemen perished by the hands of the Skraelings, a people whom they had at first so much despised.

When we see from human history, in every age and every land, how many entire nations have perished by the sword, are we not forced to the conviction that the greatest crime of nations against human nature is human warfare?

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE "OLD CATHOLICS."

IT is nineteen years since Dr. Döllinger left the Catholic Church, and three months ago he died without being reconciled. We must all of us feel a certain compassion for Dr. Döllinger. He was so superior to his own heresy and to his surroundings. He was not of the stuff of which heresiarchs are made, being rather studious than militant in his temper. "*Il Signor Döllinger*," said Pope Pius IX., "*e un dottore, ma non un pastore*"; and this is all that we should wish, in charity, to say against him. It does not appear that he ever wilfully perverted anybody; he rather assented to than sought to create new apostasies. No big separatist ever took less pains to make a following. Indeed, he appeared to be a little ashamed of his imitators. Now that we are about to speak of him with reference to that sad havoc with which his unfortunate example was associated, we should wish to do so in the kind spirit of a physiologist who has said, "There are some men who have a constitutional predisposition, after they have studied hard through a long life, to get a twist which makes them go wrong about something, though we must hope that they are not morally culpable."

Dr. Döllinger "went wrong" about obedience. But the "twist" was most manifest in the fact that his disobedience was in contradiction to his own predetermined faith. No historian had written more strongly, more enthusiastically—so far as enthusiasm could ever be noted in his calm style—in favor of the "infallibility" of the Supreme Pontiff than had the reputed author of the new religion called "Old Catholicism." (It is true that he was only "reputed" to be its author, for he warmly opposed its constitution as a new "church.") In his private and in his official life he had often expressed his conviction that there could be no appeal from the Supreme Head of the Church. One example may suffice, and it was in 1845, when he was addressing a company of savants at Munich. "Gentlemen," he said, "the question is this: it is true that the infallibility of the Pope is not a dogma defined by the Church; yet any one who should maintain the contrary would put himself in opposition to the conscience of the whole Church, in the present as in the past." From his "History of the Church" it would be easy to quote whole pages which contain examples of the *action* of the early Church in her insistence on the *truth* of infallibility. Here are two or three fragments, which may suffice:

"There are not wanting names and titles which, in the fourth and fifth centuries, fully expressed the supreme ecclesiastical power and dignity of the Pope. He was called the Father of the Fathers, the Shepherd and Guardian of the flock of Christ, the Chief of all Bishops, the Guardian of the vineyard of Christ. The Church of Rome was named, by pre-eminence, the Apostolic See, the Chief of all the Churches, the rock and foundation of faith. . . . That the decrees of synods, regarding faith, obtained their full force and authority *only* by being recognized and confirmed by the Pope was publicly acknowledged in the fourth century. . . . The fifth General Council, held in 381, which was a council of only oriental bishops, acquired the authority of an Ecumenical Council by the subsequent acceptance and confirmation of the Pope, and St. Augustine declared, after the two African synods had been confirmed by the Pontiff, '*Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*'" (Here follow several examples of the decisions of merely isolated synods being regarded as of ecumenical value from the one fact of the Pontifical approval.) "On the other hand it was acknowledged to be the prerogative of the first See in the Christian world, that the bishop of Rome could be judged by no man. It was a thing unheard of that the head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects. He who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not truly in the Catholic Church."

Now, it would be difficult for precise writing to convey more emphatically that the whole Christian Church, "during the fourth and fifth centuries," acknowledged the infallibility of the Pope, and that Dr. Döllinger agreed with that estimate. On what possible ground of faith or consistency could decrees of councils obtain their authority, "*only* by being confirmed by the Pope," except on the ground that the Pope was believed to be, pontifically, exempt from teaching error? On what possible ground could a merely national synod enjoy ecumenical importance—the decisions of the bishops being rendered binding "*by* the acceptance and confirmation of the Pope"—except on the ground that *his* infallible teaching overruled *their* defect in point of number? On what possible ground could the first General Council of Constantinople, which condemned the heresy of Macedonius and added its definition to the creed, be recognized as of ecumenical value, or the fifth General Council, which was purely oriental (but which decreed fourteen dogmatic propositions) be regarded as didactic to the whole of Christendom, except on the ground that the authority of the Pope was regarded as the authority of God? On what possible ground could the Pope be called, by the whole Christian Church, and that, too, "in the fourth and fifth centuries,"

the rock, the foundation of faith, except on the ground that a rock and foundation are symbols of indestructible force? And further, if Dr. Döllinger assures us that it was "a thing unheard of" in those earliest times that the head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects, and that all who were not in communion with *him* were not truly in the Catholic Church, then we may say that Dr. Döllinger is our authority for the historic justice of the Vatican dogma, and that in subsequently denying it he arrayed his own testimony against the novelty of his "Old Catholic" position.

Well might Mgr. von Ketteler write of Dr. Döllinger, *after* the Doctor's lapse from the faith: "I am with that Döllinger whose teaching in former days filled his disciples with love and enthusiasm for the Church and the Holy See, but I have nothing in common with that Döllinger whom the enemies of the Church and of the Holy See load with praises."

Yet we cannot class the fallen Döllinger with that weak and babbling crew which took the lead in the formation of the new sect, perhaps the weakest and most babbling of all the self-worshipping Protestants who ever tried to make a schism in the Church. Let us recall a few of the vagaries of this new sect, so as to better appreciate the silliness of that disobedience which the example of one great man rendered respectable. Take away Dr. Döllinger from the Old Catholics, and their insignificance would have been their best shield from ridicule. Take away the Old Catholics from Dr. Döllinger, and his importance as a separatist would have been increased. Old Catholicism is now dead, though not buried. Let us remember, just for a moment, what it *was*, so that we may both appreciate the mistake of its only master, and its own immeasurable puerility and inanity.

We may, most of us, remember that very comic little congress which was held just after the closing of the Vatican Council, and which was known in the minute history of the new sect as "the Congress of the Old Catholics at Cologne." At that congress were gathered most of the "brilliant lights" of the new apostasy—of the German, Russian and also Anglican schools of heresy. We recollect that the schismatical Archbishop of Syra and Tenos sent his blessing to this motley little gathering; that Dean Stanley, of Westminster, who was a sort of suppressed drawing-room Arian, honored the conversations with his presence; that Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, did the same thing, though neither gentleman held a brief for his own communion; and we remember that the Bishop of Lincoln uttered this remarkable sentence, which was thought perfectly worthy of the "new attitude": "In the Church which is truly Catholic, the battle is to be fought against

the heretical and schismatical Church of the Papacy ;" adding as a very fine rhetorical outburst, "the Pope has trampled under foot all laws, both human and divine." And the German separatists were fully worthy of such allies. There were Profs. Reinkens and Schulte ; the former, like Zwingli, surpassing his Luther, and the latter, like Carlstadt, eclipsing them both ; and there was Prof. Friedrich, perhaps the vainest man of the century, who carried self-praise to a point that was captivating. This gentleman kept a diary, and his friends quoted it. It was full of most interesting self-conceits. Prof. Friedrich was, in Prof. Friedrich's opinion, by far the most distinguished man who ever lived, and they who opposed him—that was, the whole Catholic Church—were correspondingly deficient in wisdom. The Catholic bishops, he wrote, were "all afraid of him." "A mean and stupid majority," "a council of robbers and hypocrites" had approved the new dogma of infallibility. "The Holy Spirit must first constrain the bishops to become theologically capable"—that was, to think with Prof. Friedrich—"before they can be rendered His organs to define any article of the faith." "All the German bishops are poor in theology and in scientific culture," and so on through a great many pages. It was evident that whatever doubt might exist in regard to the infallibility of the Pope, there was none whatever about Prof. Friedrich's.

The Congress proceeded to pass its resolutions. The first of them will suffice for quotation ; it reads like a joke from a comic paper : "No excommunication or suspension, on the ground of refusal to accept the Vatican decrees, shall be valid." That settled the matter. Cologne *locuta est*.

But to turn from pure comedy, which is chiefly interesting as showing that all schisms and heresies are ridiculous, invariably illustrating the truth of the saying, "No man with a sense of humor should be a heretic," let us ask how was the new movement received by the Protestant world, and especially in Germany and in England? In Bavaria the sympathies of the king and people were for a time warmly given to Dr. Döllinger, while Herr Von Lutz, Minister of Worship, and the leader of the anti-Catholic party, addressed a threatening letter to the Archbishop of Munich when he presumed to excommunicate the great Doctor. The University of Munich elected him to be its president by a majority that was simply overwhelming ; he was decorated by his own sovereign with the Order of Merit of Bavaria, and by the German emperor with the order of the Red Eagle ; and he was also elected, as successor to Baron Liebig, to the office of president of the Royal Academy of Munich, a scientific more than a literary institution. As to England, the University of Oxford made him

an honorary D.C.L., and as to Scotland, the University of Edinburgh warmly begged him to come and "occupy a chair," while as to clerical sympathies they were almost too oppressive. Anglican bishops joined hands with Prof. Huber and Père Hyacinthe in proclaiming him their theological ally, an honor which he evidently held to be equivocal; while Dean Stanley, of Westminster, who had stood Père Hyacinthe's "best man" when he was married at the registrar's office in Marylebone, went to Cologne, as we have already stated, to shake hands with the great Doctor, whom, however, he could not persuade to become an Anglican. And at the same time there poured forth from the English press ringing hymns of adulation and sympathy; the religious and the secular newspapers vying in their eulogy of this new Luther who had come to light at a critical moment. It was a little curious, in the apprehension of English Catholics, that Dr. Döllinger, who had positively never been mentioned—if heard of—by the learned or the unlearned English Protestants, whether in clerical, or in lay, or in profane circles, should suddenly have become "the most distinguished of German clerics, who had always held the first place among German Catholics." He must himself have been a little surprised at his new-found fame. Indeed, to do him justice, he had always been unobtrusive, amiable, hospitable, but reserved; a man of books rather than of pulpits or platforms, and much too critical to be imposed upon by flattery. Yet the English press dragged him into a prominence from which his quiet disposition would have shrunk. Just as he was superior to his own heresies, and superior to his Old Catholic followers, so was he superior to the twaddle of mock sympathy, which meant only, "you make one more of *us*."

And now the little schism was completed, and Dr. Döllinger settled down into being a heretic. Let us ask—since his future life was to be studious, just as his past life had been so—how did his new literary ventures harmonize with his early Catholic productions? And that we may answer this question the better, let us consider the several stages by which he arrived ultimately at revolt. "No one changes his faith in a night," may be said of every Catholic who turns Protestant. As Dr. Johnson wisely remarked to Mr. Boswell, the leap from believing so much to the believing so little is, in most cases, too terrible to be sincere. Now, Dr. Döllinger, so far back as 1860, had begun to show sympathies that were risky. It was in the spring of that year that he delivered at Munich two lectures on the temporal power of the Pope, and it was just at this time that the secret societies in Italy were plotting against the temporalities of the Holy See. To have taken the hostile side at such a moment was, to say the least of it, inoppor-

tune. Finding that he had occasioned some little scandal, he wrote a work (of great literary merit), which he entitled "The Church and the Churches; or, The Papacy and the Temporal Power"; a work which was soon translated into English by Mr. William Bernard McCabe. The good points in this work, from the purely Catholic point of view, were (1) the uncompromising confession of the Catholic faith; (2) the very careful and very critical distinguishing between the essences and the accidents of the Catholic Church; and (3) the scathing sarcasm on the fallacies of the Church of England, on her contradictions in doctrine and in polity. As to Anglican doctrines, the author called them "a collection of heterogeneous theological propositions, tied together by the Act of Uniformity; propositions which, in a logical mind, cannot exist by the side of one another, and whose effect upon the English Churchman is that he finds himself involved in contradictions and disingenuousness, and can only escape the painful consciousness of it by sophistical reasoning." (From which passage we must infer that Anglican Churchmen were in too great a hurry when they looked upon the "converted" Döllinger as one of themselves.)

But in 1868 there appeared a work, called "Janus," published in Germany, but without confessed authorship, though it was believed to have been supervised by Dr. Döllinger, and in this work the Protestant spirit was so blatant, so unconcealed that it was impossible not to see what was designed by it. Cardinal Manning, in his "History of the Vatican Council," calls this work an elaborate attempt of many hands to destroy by profuse misquotations from history the authority of the Pope, and to create animosity against the future Council." Now we do not know what part Dr. Döllinger may have taken in the putting together of this piece of hostile machinery; we only know that he "supervised" the production, and, therefore, must have more or less approved of it. Nor was this the only "suspicious" performance of Dr. Döllinger's. A short time before the publication of this work—some time in the year 1864—Dr. Döllinger had committed himself to a very dangerous step, in combating an Encyclical of Pius IX. It has been suggested that he was animated by somewhat unfriendly feelings towards the illustrious Pontiff who reigned so long, but who did not recognize in Dr. Döllinger the trustworthy *pastore*, though he respected him as a profoundly read *dottore*. Personal considerations are thus thought to have weighed with him, in his opposition to the decree of the Vatican Council. It would be unfair, perhaps, to lay stress upon such rumors; yet it seems likely, from the general tone of his controversy, during the ten years which

preceded the Council, that he was not quite master of himself intellectually, because morally he was disturbed by wounded vanity.

There was, then, no sudden break between the Catholic Dr. Döllinger and the Dr. Döllinger who finally suffered excommunication; there was rather a "leading up" from a disposition to merely question to a disposition to absolutely rebel against authority. Yet, if we go a long way back, say, to a little more than thirty years ago, we can find nothing in the writings of Dr. Döllinger which would give a hint as to his future falling away. Indeed, may we not say, as to the whole of his publications previous to the year 1860, that Catholics owe him a debt of sincere gratitude for his intellectual services to Catholic truth? His "History of the Church," his books on "the Doctrine of the Eucharist During the First Three Centuries," his "Reformation, Its Interior Development and Its Effects," his "Sketch of Luther," his "Christianity and the Church," his "Fables with Regard to the Popes," his "Origin of Christianity," and also his "Religion of Mohammed," are books which no Catholic can read without feeling wiser, perhaps better. Nor can we wholly refuse our admiration to his recent writings, published subsequently to his lapse from the faith, "The Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Church," published in 1873, and "The History of the Council of Trent," published in 1876, show the normal studious spirit of Dr. Döllinger, though "the twist" is too manifest to be misleading. And it is to be noted in Dr. Döllinger's favor that he was warmly opposed to the German Kulturkampf, and always insisted on the Catholic right to religious freedom. He was never wholly perverted by his falling away. Nor did he perform ecclesiastical functions after he had been formally excommunicated. He lived the life rather of a student than of a rebel, and even continued to be on good terms with his Catholic friends.

So much must be conceded in the way of praise. Yet just as he had taken ten years to become heretical, so was his heresy slowly progressive after his fall. He announced at the Bonn conference, in 1874, that he was not bound by the Council of Trent; and this meant that he was not bound by any Council. He also rejected the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, while advancing some novel theories of his own. At the time of his death no one knew what he believed, and probably he did not quite know himself. Protestants seldom stand still in heresy. Deep calls to deep in that infinity.

The intimate associate at one time of the brilliant Lamennais, and the intimate friend for twenty years of the learned Montalembert, he was also an admirer of the eloquent Lacordaire, with whom he made a journey to Rome. These three wonderful men

would naturally impress him; though indeed there was a great difference between the three. Shall we say that Lamennais was rash, almost fanatical; Montalembert was both profound and romantic; Lacordaire, whose commanding eloquence seemed to spring from his intense faith, was rather "inspired" than learned or scientific. How far such characteristics were accidental, or really made up the substance of their natures, it is not at all desirable to speculate; yet when we think of these three men as companions of Döllinger, we see that there was not one of them at all like him. He was what is called scientific. The son of a distinguished physiologist, his earliest passion had been to study natural history. He would watch insects on the wing, and distinguish their species by the peculiarities of their flying or settling. Next came a great love for reading; so that the whole of his pocket money went to the booksellers; Greek, Latin, French, English, Italian being all of them familiar to him while still young. When he became an undergraduate at the university of Würzburg, he made up his mind to be a priest; and at the beginning of his career he was assistant-priest in a country village, though he seems to have stayed there only a year. His splendid talents and great learning being already well known, he was made a professor in the seminary of Aschaffenburg; and within a very short period was promoted to a professorship in his always favorite university of Munich. And now began the fixed ways of his long life—ways always studious and tranquil. He rose at five every morning, and worked for about twelve hours a day. For very nearly sixty years he lived in the same town, and for the greater part of the time in the same house. In the summer he usually journeyed to France, Italy, or England, and once he paid a short visit to Ireland. He never permitted himself any idle recreations—his usual summer vacations alone excepted—though he was much attached to the society of his friends.

Yet Dr. Döllinger was a politician, and an earnest one. He represented his university in the Bavarian parliament, and in 1848 took active part in the endeavor to reconstruct the greatly divided Germany. He seems to have headed a laudably combative Catholic party, and to have spoken with great force when it was necessary. On one occasion, when it was objected that the Pope was "the absolute ruler and master of the Church," he said in reply. "If you imagine that there is any room in the Catholic Church for a purely arbitrary power of Pope or bishop, you are greatly mistaken." Some of his friends thought that, had he cultivated public speaking, he would have risen above the ranks as a debater. Yet it seems more likely that as editor of a paper—a position which he held for some years—he was more thoroughly at home than he

was in oratory; his dialectical skill as an "ecclesiastical politician" (a phrase which was applied to him by one of his friends) being best shown in neat, pungent writing.

And now to accompany Dr. Döllinger to Rome. It is thirty years since the cannon of Magenta and Solferino proclaimed the downfall of the Austrian dominion in Italy; an event which was quickly followed by the general concert of the Carbonari, and of the whole of the revolutionary spirits of Italy, who saw their opportunity and tried to seize it. Dr. Döllinger appeared to think that they might be justified. His view, so far as one can trace it in his friends' reports, was, that the temporal power was a good thing while it should last, but that, if destroyed, the Pope would do quite as well without it. We may quote his words, however, published in 1861, as throwing light on the state of his mind at that period, for there is a strange interest attaching to "views" upon this subject—the subject of the moral justice of the usurpation. True it is—though we need not now stay to account for it—that many men who have "gone wrong" in regard to faith, have gone wrong antecedently as to the temporal power, as though an obliquity in regard to a point of natural justice opened the door to graver obliquity on spiritual truths. However, Dr. Döllinger may be quoted as writing at least calmly and sincerely: "Let no one lose faith in the Church if the temporal principality of the Papacy should disappear, whether it be for a season or for ever. It is not essence, but accident; not end, but means. It began late; it was formerly something quite different from what it is now. It now justly appears to us to be indispensable, and so long as the existing order lasts in Europe, it must at all cost be maintained; or, if it is virtually interrupted, it must be restored. But it is possible to suppose a condition of Europe in which it would be superfluous, and then it would be only a clogging burden." Dr. Döllinger lived long enough, after the usurpation of the temporal power, to see that no new "condition of Europe" could justify the commission of a great crime.

Yet, though he lived long enough to be often disillusioned, he could never persuade himself to profit by such lessons, in the undoing of the great mistakes of his life. Those mistakes were chiefly two: the entering into polemical conflict with the Pontiff, and the refusing to accept the Vatican dogma. Unlike his great friend, Montalembert, he allowed a sort of *odium theologicum* to embitter his inner life and natural heart. His position, intellectually, became ridiculous. Recognizing some sort of moral authority in the Holy See—so far even as to obey it after his own fall—he at the same time refused to be taught the truth by that authority from which alone he had declared all dogma to proceed. More than

this, he refused to accept the Vatican dogma, although it had been approved by a Conciliar majority which, as a historian, he knew to be unprecedented. So that he really threw overboard both the Conciliar decision and the decision of the Sovereign Pontiff; and this too on a subject of which he had said twenty-six years previously: "Any one who should maintain the contrary" (of Infallibility) "would put himself in opposition to the conscience of the whole Church, in the present as in the past." Such a new position was therefore ridiculous. It was not only untenable, it was ridiculous. And the whole Catholic world viewed it in that light. The very men who *did* follow Dr. Döllinger into the desert of a formal excommunication, were men who by their feebleness, their nobodiness, proved the hopelessness of getting a respectable following. The sympathizers from other sects were simply grotesque; a dozen or two of heretics who would not agree about anything, save that the Pope was "heretical and schismatical." We can well imagine the playful scorn which Dr. Döllinger must have inwardly felt for his new-found friends in the bitterness of his exile, friends of whom he had written, in "The Church and the Churches," "they are involved in contradictions and disingenuousness, and can only escape the painful consciousness of it by sophistical reasoning." Some of the minor features of the painful comedy of his new position must also have humiliated, if they amused him. At Cologne—where he had to listen to the comical resolution, "No excommunication or suspension on the ground of refusal to accept the Vatican decree shall be valid," he must have met the bridegroom, Père Hyacinthe, who was said at the time (by the English newspapers) to have had his bride with him at a hotel during the Congress. Père Hyacinthe was not asked to address the Congress, probably from a sense of humor which, even in new Old Catholics, could not brook such a broad jest as that. But Dean Stanley, who had been Père Hyacinthe's "best man," was asked to address the Congress, and addressed it; though he discreetly avoided alluding to his married friend, or to the lady who was stopping at the hotel. (Pius the Ninth said, when he heard of this Old Catholic marriage, "Divine Providence has His own way of punishing people.") Comedy, or rather farce, was the entire movement. And yet it was with such a shockingly vain folly that the grave and the really venerable Dr. Döllinger had to unite himself, mind, heart and soul. He could not do it. Dr. Döllinger was then seventy-one years old. He had spent his life in deep research and in perfect probity. He might condemn himself for his next nineteen years to fellowship with sectarians, but he could never feel at home with them—nor with his new self.

Only sixty-two Old Catholic priests are now to be found in

Germany; and it seems likely that within another twenty years the sect will have reached its irreducible minimum, not only in regard to priests, but also laity. The "great man" is gone, whose "commanding personality" (in the language of the London *Saturday Review*) gave the sect a consideration not its own. And yet it is a melancholy fact that even the lesson *he* has left—a grave lesson because he was a grave man—has borne no fruit in the minds of most Protestants. Thus, the before-named *Saturday Review*, when speaking of his death, used these curiously inappropriate words: "He bore unflinchingly the sentence which drove him out of the Church. . . . From the bitterness of the present he kept his eye fixed on that future from which he knew, however distant the date, the vindication of his Catholicity must come." The same "criticism" might have been passed on every heretic from the days of Cerinthus to those of Döllinger. No heretic, no schismatic, has ever troubled the Church except on the pretext that *his* orthodoxy was the Old Catholicism, while the teaching of the Church was a new doctrine. How else should a man justify his rebellion? It is quite certain that what is new must be false; it is quite certain that definitions, if didactic of what is new, must be opposed to the unchangeable Christian truth. Catholics and Protestants must be agreed upon that point. The curious thing with Protestants—Old Protestants or New Protestants—is, that they insist on regarding themselves as infallible, while they attribute fallibility to Authority. Popes may err, Councils may believe untruths, but Doctor this or Professor that is an *ecclesia docens*, who is preserved by the Divine Wisdom from thinking wrongly. Indeed, the grand distinction between Catholicity and Protestantism is that, whereas in Catholicity there is only one Pope, in Protestantism there are as many popes as there are Protestants. "There is no infallibility," shrieks the heretic, "though I am myself personally infallible to decide *that* point. Indeed, *my* infallibility is the alone postulate. For, if I am *not* infallible, then it follows that it is impossible for any Christian in the world to know the truth: to affirm which, is to affirm that to believe the truth or to believe error is, intellectually and spiritually, of equal virtue. Ergo, if Christianity is to stand at all, it can only stand on the ground of *my* infallibility; and as to the other gentlemen who agree with me as to their own infallibility, though they pronounce me to be wrong in my divine teaching, well, let me hope that they are in good faith—that is, if there be any good faith where infallibility itself is a roving quantity."

This infallibility of the fallible being a Protestant dogma, and the fallibility of the infallible a sort of corollary, we must be always prepared for the most extravagant admiration of anybody who

typically illustrates such truisms. And, curiously, the very cleverest and even most ingenuous Protestants will sometimes worship the Great Inconsistents. Thus Mr. Gladstone, like the *Saturday Review*, is a great admirer of the schismatical attitude of Dr. Döllinger. "He is to be honored with reverence and love, because in him the spirit of self was down-trodden and extinct, that he might live a larger life; and because pursuing truth as he best could see it, in the spirit of courage and of peace, he united in his aims the things most precious to mankind, and set one more great example for the generations to come." So that "the spirit of self is down-trodden and extinct" only when we oppose our opinions to Divine authority; the "spirit of peace" is in the sowing of discord and divisions; and "the one more great example for the generations to come" is in the one more act of overt rebellion against the Church, and in the one more effort to give scandal by the worship of Number One, and by the supreme contempt for the Living Voice of the Holy Spirit. We, of course, entertain the most profound respect for the political grandeur and the personal eminence of Mr. Gladstone, and we only wish that his fatal "twist" in the single province of heresy did not lead him to write what is simply nonsense.

The "one more great example" having retired from this world, we should like to know how many more great examples will be required before non-Catholics will be induced to open their eyes. The simple question which was proposed to the Vatican Council, perhaps as simple a question as could be proposed to any Council, or indeed as simple a question as could be proposed to the human mind—was: Is the head of the Christian Church preserved from teaching falsehood, when he teaches what must be believed unto salvation? It was manifest that no side-question could enter into the subject, such as: Are general councils, *with* the Pope, preserved from error? because the question of Conciliar majorities would have first to be decided; and it would need infallibility to decide that question. Some Councils have been nearly unanimous; some have been widely divergent; some have been approved as authoritative by the Pope, and some have been disapproved as irregular. There could be no possibility of settling Conciliar authority, except with the aid of infallibility; and it was this very question of infallibility (with whom does it rest?) which the Vatican Council was summoned to consider. As it happened, all the bishops in the Council, three only excepted (and the Council was the largest of all general Councils), were of the same opinion as was Dr. Döllinger when he was seventy-one years of age, that "it was acknowledged (in the third and fourth centuries) to be the prerogative of the first See in the Christian world that the Bishop of Rome could

be judged by no man. It was a thing unheard of that the head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects. He who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not truly in the Catholic Church." The Council, being of this opinion, had only to refer the main question to the decision of the acknowledged head of the Church. Had the Pope disagreed with the majority, the decisions of the majority would have gone for nothing. Infallibility did not rest with the majority, nor did any bishop in the Council suppose it did. Infallibility rested only with the head. And now suppose, for the sake of testing the Protestant error, that the Pope had taught that Popes were not infallible; in other words, that the Popes, when teaching what is the truth (solely, of course, as to the doctrines necessary to salvation), could be permitted by the Holy Spirit, or had been permitted by the Holy Spirit, to teach lies as being the divine truths of Christianity. What must have been the consequence of that decision? First, there would have been an end of divine faith; since it would have been an absolute impossibility for the human intellect to have divine faith in what was pronounced to be only human conjecture. The Pope not being infallible, and all Councils being divided, the Pope could never have authorized the decision of any Council, and no Council could have taught the Pope what to believe. The head, like the body, being fallible, the whole Church would have tumbled down into fallibility. Away would go the teaching, divine Church. Away would go the primary idea of a revelation; which is not a revelation of freedom for human opinion, but of obligation to believe only what is divine. The "no" of the Vatican Council would have meant: "The body is not infallible; the head is not infallible; the whole Church is without divine voice or guidance; so believe what you like; create and follow your own doctrines; and let your Christianity be *L'Église, c'est moi!*" What, then, would have been left to the Christian intellect—assuming that any intellect could be called Christian? It would still, indeed, have been possible to believe in the *fact* of a life of Christ; but since it would have been impossible to believe in the divine authority of the Church, there could be no divine authority for her doctrines. The only authority would have been private judgment, private opinion; the private interpretation of certain scriptures privately approved, with the private estimate of certain patristic views or statements. In short, Christianity would have been asserted by the Supreme Pontiff to be Protestantism *minus* its Catholic aids; a mere bundle of human opinions, tied together by pious sentiment, resting on the presumed fact of the life of Christ, and on the presumed accuracy of the Four Gospels in regard to it. Private judgment would have been enthroned as Pontiff by the Pontiff. Heresy would have been pro-

nounced by him to be an imaginary sin, a mental state that could not exist in point of fact, since no man can be disobedient to his own opinion. Schism would have been declared by him to be the most honorable separation of every man's own religion from that of his neighbor. Error would have been the differing from one's own impressions. Authority would have been the commanding of ourselves to obey ourselves. Disobedience would have been unfaithfulness to our own conceits. And so on, through the category of Christian virtues. Yet in picturing all these absurdities we should be simply describing what Protestantism *would be*, were it not happily saved from itself by Catholic teaching. Protestantism, *per se*, is pure egotism. Left to itself it is only speculative negativeness, tempered by the personal sentiment of Christian piety. But, most happily, the traditions which have come down to it from the Catholic Church, *plus* the living teaching of the Catholic Church before its eyes, enable it to live above its own fallacies, and to try to unite the two extremes, faith and heresy.

So that we may ask of the *Saturday Review*, and of Mr. Gladstone: Why should you be sorry that the Vatican Council decided that there is truth; and that all Christians can know infallibly what it is? Why should you be sorry that there never can be (and never was) Catholic dispute as to the final authority of any Council, Catholic doubt as to its teaching truth or teaching falsehood? Why should you be sorry that divine faith is *not* human opinion? that bitter controversy, sectarianism, schism, deadly hatreds, are removed out of the path of the obedient Christian, who has quite enough to do in trying to save his own soul, without being his own Council, his own Pontiff—we might almost say his own Divine wisdom—in inventing and creating his own creed? Or, conversely, why should you be glad that Dr. Döllinger set the example of stultifying the teachings of his own long life, of preaching self-opinion in matters of divine faith, whereas he *had* preached the duty of obedience? Why should you be glad that a grand and noble historian, who had devoted his labors to proving the truth of Roman Catholicity, should have died excommunicated, unrepentant, unhappy; “his funeral obsequies being performed by Prof. Friedrich, assisted by the Greek archimandrite and some English clergy?” The picture is not edifying nor lovable. We would rather have read that Dr. Döllinger had sought his peace in his last hours by asking to be reconciled with God's Vicar, whose office, whose authority, whose supreme power he had passed some fifty years in supremely honoring. What is there in the bewitchment of this arrogance, of this revolt against the instinct of obedience, which so intoxicates the intellect, the heart and soul of most Protestants that it makes them fall down

and adore the god heresy? Curious "twist" of many otherwise admirable souls! Mr. Gladstone would think a man insane who should approve such a political resolution as "no ostracism inflicted by English society, and no punishment inflicted by English magistrates, shall be accounted valid by the new, perfectly independent democrat." Yet he applauds the jest—the grim "spiritual" jest—of Dr. Döllinger approving the "resolution" that persons who have been excommunicated by the Catholic Church are not only not excommunicated, but have become the Church; the late Church, which was the Catholic Roman Church, having been deposed by the new Protestants of Cologne, for having dared to use its authority against *them*. Was it not St. Gregory Narianzen who said: "Suffer me to be merry on a merry subject," when he was twitting some "Old Catholics" of his own day? The comedy of heresy was always the same; rendered the more broad by the fact of its pretensions being not only human, but divine. Its inconsistency is the soul of its comedy. Statesmen, who look upon disloyalty as a capital crime, advocate disloyalty to the Holy See. Literary critics, who make sport of human pretensions, fall down in homage at the feet of a sectarian who prefers his own wisdom to the Catholic Church's. Men who have no particular belief in any religion, but sit lightly to even the fact of the Christian Redemption, are filled with applause for a man who has left the Church, though he cannot precisely tell us what he does believe; while at the same time they are shocked by the consistency of the Holy See, which simply says to those who want to be their own Pontiffs, "there is room only for one pontiff in the Christian Church." The indignation of the Protestants at the positive faith of any Catholic is in the proportion of their own doubtingness or negation; while their approval of the disobedience of any heretic is in the proportion of their own love for self-pleasing. Now all this may be human nature, speaking morally, but it is not "scientific" intellectually. Mr. Gladstone, with his superb energy of intelligence, knows, intellectually, that if human things require judgment, divine things require infallibility; he knows intellectually that the wisdom of the Holy Spirit is impossible to the apprehension of the natural man, and he knows, intellectually, that, Divine Truth being One, any lie as to a Christian Doctrine must be diabolical. Knowing this, he should not talk about the "great example" of an aged Christian falling down and worshipping his own conceits, and trying to add one more new church to the thousand Protestant churches which have already ridiculed the Divine Unity of the Divine Mind.

Englishmen who remember the assembling of the Vatican Council, and who watched its progress from beginning to end (though,

in truth, it was not ended, but only stopped, by the political impediments thrown in its way), will also remember the tone of the English press in regard to its objects and deliberations. The assumption was that the Vatican Council was originated by the Jesuits for the purpose of imposing a new dogma, Infallibility, on the unwilling consciences of the Catholic world. This being taken for granted, it was next necessary to demonstrate that the Council was "not free in its deliberations"; the few dissentients who dared to speak their minds being nobly contrasted with the scores who dared not do so. Finally, when the Pope promulgated the dogma, the vast majority of the Council were called timorous, and the few dissentients or inopportunist were praised to the skies—until *they* also gave an example of obedience. The English press, being disappointed by this "weak" submission to authority, was driven to seek consolation outside the Council, and the outbreak of a little schism in Germany caused it unspeakable rejoicing. This "attitude" of the press was warmly encouraged by English bishops, by English clergy of even advanced High Church views; in short, the "attitude" of half England meant: "Thank God for another schism, for another, though extremely stale, Protestant heresy." Dr. Döllinger became the hero of all free-thinkers. Let us say our last word of the departed hero, in a hopeful spirit that the utter fiasco of his "great example" may lead *another* generation to profit by it. For the present generation there seems to be little hope; yet, perhaps the reason is, that the experiment of High Churchism has not been fully wrought out to its bitter end. High Churchism is only forty years old, and Ritualism is little more than twenty; and this is true in all parts of the Protestant world, in free America and in tradition-hampered England. Many Protestants are still deceiving themselves with the idea—it is not an expectation but an idea—that the watchwords of the New Catholicism within High Churchism may take substance as an actual possession of Catholic heritage; that even "Rome" may come to be respectful to that "idea of corporate re-union" which is based on pious sentiment, *minus* obedience. True, such persons do not consider the difference between submission and an exceedingly amiable invitation to agree with *them*; yet, at least, they admire unity in the abstract, and they may possibly—or, what is more likely, their children, "the next generation," may, possibly—come to confess the truth, that "submission" and "invitation" are quite opposed in point of will, if not of sentiment. The present generation seems still tentative. Speculation, not decision, is its mood. And, unhappily, a large section of the Ritualists have taken to abusing the very Church they desire to imitate—the Catholic Church, with which they "pray for corporate re-union."

Poor Dr. Littledale, who died just after Dr. Döllinger, was one of those who was too impatient to only "pray"; he found the delay so very painful to his aspirations that he took to reviling the whole fabric of the Catholic Church, its history, councils, orders, even its clergy. He was the most intensely Protestant Anglican of the present age. Now he is gone, perhaps his admirers may come to think—what the admirers of Dr. Döllinger may also think—that the spirit of protest against authority is no more religion, is no more Christianity, than is the spirit of protest against morality. High Churchism has now arrived at this point in its demonstration, that it is proved to be only able to exist as a theory on the postulate of the corruption of the Catholic Church, and this postulate must make "corporate re-union" most undesirable, even if it does not make it anti-Christian. Men do not want to be united with teachers of error; so, "Rome" teaching error, the whole ground of "corporate re-union" is taken away from the Dr. Littledales and the Dr. Döllingers. The present generation of Ritualists, or High Churchmen, have worked out the "re-union" problem to this point: that (1) re-union being desirable, but (2) re-union being impossible on account of the corruption of the Catholic Church, (3) there is nothing left but either to submit or to revile. Now, reviling has gone on for three centuries. So that High Churchism must either profess itself to be the infallible teacher of the Catholic Church, or must abandon its claims to be a Church at all. It cannot both teach the Church and *not* be infallible, for this were to say that one fallible has the power to teach another fallible what is, infallibly, the whole divine truth; or else it is to say that the personal enlightenment of High Churchmen is as a sun compared with the candle of Catholic brains. Was there ever such a muddle in a muddled mind? And the hope is that the coming generation, having inherited the practical proofs of the absurdity, having digested all the theories, and witnessed all their results, and been made aware of the miserable end of the Döllingers and the Littledales, and all the strivers against logic and against common sense, will first treat themselves to a manly laugh at the comic side of the absurdity, and then address themselves to their spiritual obligations. If Dr. Döllinger's fiasco should help on this happy solution, he will have done something, unwittingly, for his brother-Protestants. Even Dr. Littledale will have helped to shiver to atoms the delusion that there can be corporate re-union with a wicked Church. At least, we may say that, if such men do not prove the truth, they help to prove the absurdity of false positions, and this is something in an age of false positions. "Good old Protestantism" seemed to be almost honest in its wild theory that there is no Church, and there are no doctrines, save

what every man chooses to invent for his satisfaction out of his private interpretation of the Four Gospels and the Epistles. Here we had a grand, sweeping hypothesis, which got rid at one blow of all Councils, all dogmas, all pontiffs, all authority, all obedience. It was almost magnificent in its demolition. Christianity was clean gone—bar sentiment. But the modern theories for trying to combine exact opposites have only intensified the spirit of “rank” Protestantism, in the fact that they have *included* Pontiffs, Councils and dogmas, with all authority, sacraments and also discipline, within the area of every man’s private judgment.

WHEN BRIGHAM YOUNG WAS KING.

I.

IT is about twenty-four years, so far as we can ascertain, since the first Mass was said in Salt Lake City. The celebrant was Rev. E. Kelly. The place was an old adobe building on the site of the present church. The Mormon capital was then under the spiritual jurisdiction of Right Rev. Eugene O’Connell, Bishop of Grass Valley, California. In December, 1866, Father Foley became second resident-pastor. Utah passed from Bishop O’Connell to Bishop Machebœuf, and from him to Archbishop Alemany, who, in January, 1871, appointed Rev. P. Walsh pastor. Father Walsh built the present church, which was dedicated November 26, 1871, under the patronage of St. Mary Magdalen. It is situated on the west side of East Second street, about 200 feet north of the northwest corner, and is 34 by 60 feet, exclusive of the sanctuary. The basement is built of stone, the rest of brick. The style is said to be Gothic, but it did not strike the writer as distinctively such. It has a very clean, neat appearance, but is rather small for the congregation. Sometimes it is called in the holy city “The Little Church around the Corner.”

In August, 1873, Father Scanlan succeeded Father Walsh, and thirteen years later became Vicar Apostolic of Utah. All Hallows College, St. Mary’s Academy, St. Joseph’s School for small boys, convents and schools at Ogden, Park City, Silver Reef, and three hospitals, are but a few of the good works set on foot by this zealous prelate. Catholics in Utah have increased a hundred

per cent during the last ten years. In no other part of America have they had such a struggle for existence. They came at the risk of their lives. Not open warfare, as in parts of New England, was to be dreaded as much as secret assassination, taught and justified under the name of "blood atonement" by the Latter-Day Saints, who, as avenging angels, sometimes destroyed members of their own body through love, to procure them a more certain admission to the Mormon heaven, and were always ready, when so directed, to destroy the intruding Gentile through hatred. The priests were threatened and circumvented in every possible way. But Father Kelly averted serious consequences by a bold stroke of policy; he put himself under the protection of the arch-conspirator, Governor Young himself, and caused it to be generally understood that, if he were made away with by the belligerent Indians,—always convenient scape-goats for Mormon atrocities,—he had friends in high places who, like the twenty thousand Cornish men of the ballad, "should know the reason why."

Poorer and meaner, then, in a worldly sense, than the beginnings of the Church in the Cenacle, in the upper chamber, or on the morning of Pentecost, were the beginnings of the Church in Utah—a handful of miners, smelters, stokers, besmeared and begrimed, led by apostolic men, whose garments were poorer than the coarse raiment of their disciples, who felt the pinching of hunger, and whose privations gave additional zest to their cheerfulness. But "Jesus stood in the midst of them," and Mary was their shield. And so, having nothing, they possessed all things.

II.

Before the opening of the railroad, few,¹ besides the saints, found their way to Salt Lake City. Occasionally, some trappers and traders, a Mexican caravan, or a band of Indians fresh from the war-path, stood without the walls begging admission; but as a rule the inmates were little disturbed by pilgrims from the outer world. The soldiers and the railways made it comparatively safe to enter the Mormon capital; the Gentiles began to come, and not a few of them came to stay in Zion.

About twenty years ago Right Rev. James O'Gorman, Vicar

¹ Gold-seekers and other emigrants, going by land to California, sometimes visited Utah, not always a safe proceeding, as the Mountain Meadows' massacre showed. But this terrible blot on his memory King Brigham desired should be forgotten. The cairn,—who would expect to find a Celtic cairn in Utah?—the stone on which was engraved, "Here one hundred men, women and children, from Arkansas, were massacred in cold blood, early in September, 1857," and the red cedar cross, with the words, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord," were all destroyed by order of Brigham. When the massacre of these emigrants took place, Young was Governor of Utah, Commander-in-Chief of the Militia, and Indian Agent.

Apostolic of Nebraska, sent two religieuses of his vicariate to the western portion of the continent on some business connected with the good of religion, and it was arranged that their itinerary should include Salt Lake City. At that period, and indeed until his death in 1877, Brigham Young was *de facto* king of Utah, and had been privately anointed as king in an early period of his despotism. Immigrants had come in myriads. Before 1853 fifteen thousand had found their way to the region of the blest. The saints were in a chronic state of oriental prostration before the terrible Mokanna, some of whose sons and daughters assumed superiority over their fellow-citizens, as being of the "blood-royal" of King Brigham.

The religieuses reached the holy city in June, and never could they forget the beautiful appearance it presented as they moved towards it. In form it seemed semi-circular. Beyond it, lying, as one might say, at its feet, was the vast sheet of water known as the Great Salt Lake. On almost every side, sheltered by the Oquirrh and the Wasatch ranges, its rich lawns and fragrant meadows contrasted charmingly with the bleak hills and alkali deserts in its vicinity. Travellers arriving in early summer, when the place looks its best, were wont to call it the "Pink City," from the thousands of peach-trees scattered in every direction, whose limbs and branches were covered with the beautiful pink blossoms of that luscious fruit.

Their descent into Zion rather drove away the illusion as to its extraordinary beauty. The streets were over one hundred and thirty feet wide, and seemed wider because many of the dwellings were set far back from the sidewalks. Being unpaved, as they are still, they were seas of mud, or saharas of stifling dust, according as rain or sunshine prevailed. On either side were artificial brook-lets, in which water from the mountain streams sparkled in the sun, and from which the gardens were watered by means of a hose, for rain seldom falls in the sacred city. The houses were mostly low, one or two stories, and each had peach and apple-trees in front, and in the rear, currant and gooseberry-bushes, with some kitchen vegetables. Around them were hideous walls of mud and adobes, and the gates at the entrance were prison-like. Indeed, a great part of the town was surrounded by a wall, never finished, of which little remains save some weed-grown mounds. It has crumbled away, as will, also, the fanaticism it was erected to protect. At one place there were several rows of low huts, connected by boards. A lady asked a boy: "Whose house is that?" pointing to one of them. "My father's," was the reply. "And the next?" "My father's." "And the next?" "My father's." "Why, your father seems to own them all?" "No, only five; my mother

lives in the first, and my four aunts in the others." Plural consorts in Utah were called aunts, and were regarded as intruders by the real wife and her progeny.

The visitors were soon in the heart of the shabby little town. It was a bright day in leafy June, and the cloudless sky, the balmy air, the mountains towering above the city on every side, "seemed to proclaim," wrote one of them, "Great is the Lord, and holy is His name." In Salt Lake City there is a peculiar optical illusion as to distances, owing to the extreme clearness of the air. "How far off do you think that mountain is?" asked a friend of one of the *religieuses*. "I should say, about half a mile," was the reply. It was twenty-five miles distant.

III.

Never was town or city "boomed" or puffed into fictitious renown like the Mormon capital. At this epoch it was really only a mean, straggling little collection of huts, houses, and dugouts, and so it would be still were it not for the incoming of the hated Gentile. Its site, on the "alluvial cone" of City Creek, was in what its projectors styled the Jordan Valley. No lack of ground room here; it was divided into ten-acre squares, each square into eight lots, which were afterwards divided and subdivided. To walk around one of these blocks is to walk half a mile. Except the area, and the heads of some of the saints, almost everything about the concern was small—small houses, small gardens, small schools, if any. Even the migrations and Mormon wars were small affairs. In fact, there were not saints enough in the territory they loved to call "the State of Deseret" to make a decent strike or riot in a third-rate city. Mormonism was then what it is now, a mere local nuisance. As long as it remained pent up among the mountains and hidden from the rest of the world, it might, perhaps, live. But it could never keep its head aloft before the cloud of witnesses which the railroad poured in, or coexist with daily Gentile intercourse, unless reinforced at intervals from foreign shores. Yet the poor creatures, who formed the rank and file, were daily told it was their destiny to bring the nations of the earth under their heel; that they were the chosen people who would rule Babylon from the high places, and that they would long since have taken possession of the earth had not iniquity abounded and the charity of many waxed cold.

Passing a street full of stores, built of sun-dried brick, Temple Block, once the centre of the city, was reached. It is on a square of ten acres, surrounded by a high wall which has several gates. Within the enclosure are the unfinished Temple and the huge, ugly, turtle-shaped Tabernacle. The dreariness of the scene is

enlivened by green growing things on every side, especially young trees planted in straight rows across the big blocks. The pretty houses nestling among orchards and gardens belong chiefly to the Apostles and the lesser lights of Mormonism. The best are owned by the "Prophet, Seer, and Revelator," Brigham. The Lion House, on the northern side, where most of his consorts live, has a large lion sculptured on the portico, "resting, but watchful," a delicate compliment to the owner, who styles himself "the Lion of the Lord." The house is rather picturesque, with pointed gables and narrow dormer windows projecting from the steep roof. It was half embowered in trees and climbing plants, for the Prophet, who had the best of everything, had the finest gardens between the Missouri and his dwelling. A row of offices connects this with his official mansion, the famous Beehive House, a large white building balconied to the roof, with an observatory on the top. Its chief ornament is a huge gilt beehive, the beehive being the symbol of industry in the Home of the Faithful. Near these buildings were the storehouses for the tithing levied on all; to this day one may see people bringing offerings to the tithing-house. Behind his houses were corrals and stables for his flocks and herds. Temple Block and the Prophet's Block were walled in like forts; the sameness of the fortifications was broken by bulging bastions. Before the tithing stores the wall still stands as it did when Brigham Young was king; in other parts it has crumbled away or been replaced by less unsightly fences.

The temple was going up slowly. Before the railroad era, the pale granite used in its construction was brought in as required in bullock teams. It was ominous that Mr. Ward, who designed it, and who sculptured the lions couchant over the Lion House, seceded from the religion of the saints, and became, as Brigham said, a vile apostate. More than a quarter of a century has passed since that untoward event startled the denizens of the holy city, and the massive temple is still unfinished. Defections have always been common among those who could get away. Hence the oft repeated counsel to the saints in other lands "to flee to Zion," and seek rest "in the chambers of the Lord in the mountains," to replace the backsliders.

In the Endowment House, near Temple Block, are administered the secret ordinances of Mormonism. Other official buildings may be seen from the balconies of the Mormon pontiff, but none very imposing. The log-cabins of early days have almost entirely disappeared. Adobe cottages are scattered over the sloping ground, some in picturesque situations on the borders of streams, in the midst of smiling meadows, or crowning grassy knolls. Wings were often added to the original huts, and these dismal *succursales*

were appropriated to "plural" consorts. Specimens of primitive abodes, with roofs slanting inwards and board windows, still remain. The Three-Wife House, a long, low, one-story building, was pointed out as a sample of the best structures of the royal epoch. It is only from an elevation these places could be traced, as they were pent up behind hideous ramparts of mud and cobble-stones. Some dwellings stood back among clumps of trees, giving no sign of the life that was in them, save the inarticulate noises of bawling babies. Much of the squalor, degradation, and misery of this oasis in the desert was gracefully draped by the umbrageous trees and luxuriant climbing plants of the summer season.

IV.

Camp Douglas is said to cover the first spot in Utah claimed in the name of the United States. It was a capital offence to entertain a soldier; "no soldier shall sleep one night in Salt Lake City," the Mormons constantly protested. One evening, so some old residents say, Colonel O'Connor, U. S. A., with two or three comrades, came into the city unarmed. The great Brigham at once heard of the intrusion. "Are they armed?" he asked; being told they were not, he said, magnanimously: "Let them come; their intentions are peaceable, or they would not have come hither without arms." Soon after, the stars and stripes were planted at the camp, to float over a place which heretofore defied every king, emperor and president on earth, and acknowledged only the terrible Brigham. But the saints had no welcome for the star-spangled banner.¹ More than once has it been insulted in Utah; perhaps the only place on earth where it has been trailed in the dust, and set at half-mast on the Fourth of July.

The religeuses were guests of two Irish ladies whom they had known at Omaha. They stayed at the Townsend House, the best hotel in the place. A little before, there were no hotels. Gentiles were not encouraged to come in; the few who came boarded in Mormon families, who regarded them as heathens, and never allowed them to know anything of their domestic concerns. But the railroads brought so many Gentiles that lodging-houses became a necessity. One of the hostesses, Mrs. McClosky, described herself as grand-niece of John Philpot Curran. Her husband kept the largest livery stables in the city. The other, Mrs. Williams, was a convert to the faith. The proprietors of the inns

¹ The Mormons were taught that they owed no allegiance to the government at Washington. Though never as numerous as the population of a tenth-rate city in the United States, they swore to revenge on this nation the blood of Joe Smith, and bring all the countries of the earth into subjection to the saints. They were constantly threatening to unsheath the sword of the Almighty, not only in word but in deed.

were Mormons; the work was done and the guests were waited on by their so-called wives, the only domestic servants among the saints. The worst physical inconveniences of this heavenly Jerusalem were fleas and sand-flies, which all but assassinated new-comers. They are felt even now, despite the wire screens that barricade doors and windows.

In those days, which already seem so distant, it was deemed only right and proper that Gentile visitors should pay their respects at Camp Douglas, as an earnest of their sympathy with the United States, heretofore considered in Utah as a weak, heathenish, foreign power, destined to bite the dust, and one day beg for bread and quarter at the gates of the saints. The President had foolishly tried, with scarcely a shadow of success, to usurp the mitre of the Mormon Mikado. At no time has loyalty to the Washington government been a feature of the patriotism of the Utah hierarchy. The ladies brought their guests in a carriage up the winding road of some five miles. One of the latter wrote to a friend: "I assure you it gave us indescribable pleasure to see the United States flag waving aloft once more. It was like meeting an old friend. We had not seen it since we left Nebraska." When the carriage stopped at the top of the circuitous path that led to the fort, the party was cordially welcomed, and received with great courtesy, by Colonel Murrow, then in command, with whom the religieuses were already acquainted. The extreme beauty of the scene from the pink city in the valley to the vague blue of the distant mountain range was not unappreciated by the group. After some commonplace talk about the capital and its approaches, the colonel spoke of the horrid fanaticism that desecrated a spot to which nature had been so bountiful. He was an Episcopalian, but he "loved the Pope better than any other ecclesiastic, and hoped His Holiness would come to the United States if Victor Emmanuel should presume to treat him badly."

If it was necessary to call at Fort Douglas, it was still more essential that all birds of passage should alight at the Beehive. The colonel offered to escort the religieuses to the official residence of the potentate at whose nod so many thousands trembled. Their hostesses deemed it risky for them to go unattended. But after studying the matter in all its bearings, it seemed that such attendance, on the part of a military man,¹ might not be pleasing to the powerful magnate whom all were eager to propitiate. The most affectionate feelings that ever prevailed between the controlling powers of the Mormon church and the United States officials

¹ The United States officials did all they could to propitiate the Mormons, and overlooked much provocation given them by people who were always wanting to pose as martyrs or victims.

might be described by the words "armed neutrality." "You are perfectly safe," said the colonel, "in going without the escort I should feel honored to give you. You will be graciously received on your own account. But be not surprised if the Prophet¹ does not remove his hat in your presence. Many royal princes, and other high dignitaries from Europe and elsewhere, have called on him, but he has never uncovered his head to any of them." Brigham often declared, with characteristic modesty, that he was second to no man living, and would doff the hat to none.

The party descended from the fort and drove past Temple Block and the thoroughfare now known as Brigham street, thinking of the meeting to take place the following day, from which the religious recoiled. The Lion House and the Beehive House were in their route, giving no sign of their seventy or eighty inmates. Half hidden in their pale green shrubbery, they looked calm and lovely sleeping in the noonday sunshine. But their beauty was that of a convict ship on the southern seas, and the gleaming whiteness of their walls was as the whiteness of sepulchres, which hides all manner of corruption.

V.

Next day, at the hour appointed for the audience, the two religious presented themselves at the Beehive, the official residence of Governor Young. They were received at the porch by some apostles, and ushered into a spacious reception room, at one end of which was a platform about one foot high and twelve feet deep. On this were thirteen seats, arranged in a semicircle; the centre seat was a sort of throne for Brigham; the six on either side were for his chief bishops. Dozens of cane and walnut chairs were placed in close rows down the sides of the room. The floor was of oak and walnut in alternate strips. The walls were decorated with pictures, very poor specimens of art, of the great personages of a sect in which all proclaim themselves saints. The visitors were escorted to chairs about midway down from the platform, which was occupied by Brigham, and the elders on each side in sixes. When the ladies appeared he and the others arose. To their great astonishment, the Czar of all the Mormons uncovered his head. He then made a deep salaam and moved towards them.

Brigham was then in his seventy-first year, but looked more like a well-preserved man of fifty. He was among the few who improve in appearance as they grow older. As "a sharer in the adversity of his people, their companion and friend," there was

¹ King Brigham was frequently called "The Prophet," though as a rule his forecasting was very unfortunate, and his prophecies never verified.

nothing to distinguish him; he was simple in taste and habits, and dressed in homespun. But later he became fashionable. At all times there was something remarkable in his foot-gear. Sometimes his feet were encased in moccasins, sometimes in embroidered slippers; on this occasion, they were hidden in shining French boots of the latest fashion. He had had a season of dudishness; he could use the curling-tongs, and was even seen with his hair in papers; artificial curls should have killed him as a prophet; but, no. It was said, he was quite vain of his small, well-formed extremities, which attracted more attention than his head, save when his favorite consort curled his hair. The gray frieze and red scarf of former days were discarded; he appeared in a suit of fine broadcloth of the newest cut, looking like an English yeoman in Sunday clothes. He seemed to have lost the bluster and swagger of other days, and acquired some of the ease and graciousness we associate with a gentleman. With his intimate associates, however, he was as coarse and arrogant as ever. The self-restraint he practised before Gentiles was creditable, and hid his worst points. He looked nearly six feet high, rather stout, and had a kindly though fox-like expression, and a habit of glancing furtively at his guests, which many felt embarrassing.

On seeing him approach, the religieuses stood up to await him. Making another bow, he shook hands with them very warmly, begged them to be seated, and said effusively: "Ladies, you are the first of your high calling that ever came among us. Need I say you are most heartily welcome? I hope you have come to stay and teach our children."

Now, we regret to say that Brigham's thoughts and words did not agree when he spoke thus. Being himself uncultured, he considered education rather in the way for his followers, and preached only the gospel of work. Until forced by the presence of Gentiles, he would scarcely allow schools at all. To desire education was to be "Gentilish." To sew, weave, work in the garden, cook, be smart in the dairy, he considered education enough. Books would puff up, and make the readers despise their fathers and husbands. So far as he could achieve it, education was neglected or despised. To wish for it was to seek the flesh-pots of Egypt, and prove that the leaven of the gospel had not yet fully worked in the heart. It was commonly said of Orson Pratt, the best scholar in the sect, that he would apostatize: "His learning will lift him up till he topples over." It was said that Brigham himself never read a book through; he studied men and things. When the subject of a grammar-school was discussed, in very ungrammatical language the elders agreed that, if grammar is truth, "the spirit will lead

us jest into it a kinder nateral like, and if it aint, I aint a gwine to bother my brains and pay my money about it."

With obsequious politeness, Brigham inquired what mission of mercy had brought them to his city, and expressed a willingness to share in their good works. He graciously asked about the several institutions in which they were interested, their rules and duties, and expatiated on his own benevolent projects. They mentioned a plan on foot for the erection of a Catholic church in his city, at which he professed to be pleased and surprised. He besought them to go among his people, who would receive them well and be proud to aid them. They mentioned that a priest would make a collection in the ensuing week for the new church, and "his people" would then have an opportunity of showing their generosity. A church was greatly needed for Catholic settlers and the many Catholics that sojourned at Salt Lake City, *en route* for the Pacific slope—all of which he knew better than themselves.

There were then about sixty Gentile families in the city, most of whom had come in after the entrance of the soldiers.

Brigham had a pleasing countenance at times, but not a strong one. He assumed great dignity, so much so that "we thought it out of place," wrote the elder religieuse. He had poor conversational powers, lectured rather than conversed, and required his visitors to be good listeners. He did the talking, in the form of harangue, rhapsody, or simple narrative. On this occasion he took his guests quite into his confidence, spoke of his woes, not domestic, but political, of the Mormon problem,—there was no problem in his eyes. Like President Davis in the days of the Confederacy, he wanted only to be let alone. As though he were a sovereign prince in the time when the divine right of kings was admitted, he always spoke of the dwellers in Utah as "my people." He told of their adventures from the time they poured through the Emigration Cañon until the recent attempt of the Washington government to disturb them. He was maligned, persecuted, threatened. It was wicked to report that people could not come and go, without let or hindrance, or that justice would not be done to Gentiles in Utah, where the judges and juries were all saints. He described his grievances in pathetic language, and appeared deeply affected at the picture his fancy had painted of the sorrows that encompassed him.

His health was not as good as he wished his *clientèle* to think. "I suffer much from rheumatism," he said, plaintively; "At times I am obliged to use this cane to support me; but I suppose we must suffer something," sighed this "seer, prophet, and revelator." He was extremely plausible. His easy, gentle manner and low-

toned monologue made the listeners drowsy, but did not put them to sleep. His talk was convincing. "I listen, and my companion listens," wrote Justin McCarthy, describing his interview with the prophet, "and Brigham Young talks on; and I do declare and acknowledge that we are fast drifting into a hazy mental condition, by virtue of which we begin to regard the Mormon president as a victim of cruel persecution, a suffering martyr, and an injured angel!"

But no sensation of this nature came over the religieuses. They were disgusted rather than edified, for they had learned something of the inner lives of the Mormon oligarchy. Many years after, one of them wrote: "Stern duty compelled us to hold intercourse with this man. But we felt ill at ease the whole time we were in his presence. A creeping sensation comes over me whenever I think of our visit to the Beehive House, when Brigham Young was king."

A little before this period, a Mormon, named Godbee, had openly separated from the president, and headed a schism, his followers being known as Godbeites. They were quite numerous, and owned several good stores filled with cotton, linen, woollen stuffs of all colors, and many other useful commodities. They absorbed a good deal of trade, and to attract customers in this eminently religious town, they placed over their shops, in rude fresco, some scenes from the Old Testament, and words from Proverbs. The most striking scene was a representation of Gideon's Fleece. Condign punishment awaited every Mormon that traded in these places, especially after the signs were put up. Circumstances arising from this rebellion formed the chief trouble of the Prophet at this time, as he diffusely explained.

One of the guests said she hoped the Godbeites might find their way to the true religion, and she was happy to learn that a church to the true and living God would soon be erected.

"You take great interest in religion, then?" said he; "From this I conclude you are not an American?"

A singular conclusion for an American bishop of bishops, who protested he had no interest in anything *but* religion.

"Not by birth," was the reply.

"May I ask, madam, your native country?"

"Ireland, Mr. President; I was born in Dublin."

The great man pondered awhile.

"You have read the history of your country, and know what your people suffered for their faith for centuries. I do not find such a spirit of unity, stability and endurance anywhere as I find in the Catholic Church."

The religieuses remarked that they had met many Latter-Day

Saints who said they had been taught to revere the Catholic Church next to their own. The president gave his shoulders a French shrug, and said, smiling: "Yes, yes; we have faith in the Redeemer." Were it not for their intuitions, and a slight knowledge of his previous career, they might have thought that this sanctimonious creature was not far from the kingdom of God. He inquired what they thought of his religion? They replied, they knew little of it, adding: "But we do know, President, that Christ established on earth the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, to which we belong, and which you admire."

Brigham, who "was a law unto himself," asked if they thought they could do anything without the aid of the Spirit? "Certainly not," was the reply; "Does not the Holy Scripture declare that no man can say the Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost?"

Then he spoke of a pioneer priest of Salt Lake Valley, to whom he seemed greatly attached. Father Kelly would have been removed by a destroying angel, or reported scalped by some belligerent Indian—the missing were often accounted for in that way—but the great ruler knew well that if one priest were slain, half a dozen others would rush in to replace him. "He and I," said he, "had many pleasant chats. I don't know why he discontinued his visits. Had he come often, I cannot say what effect they might have had on me. But I never could induce him to become a Latter-Day Saint." He said much more about this priest, and then went on: "There are many things in the Catholic Church I greatly admire." He paused, and the guests took this as a sign that he wished to close the conference. But, with great dignity and composure, he waved his hand and signaled them to remain. One of them ventured to say:

"Mr. President, have you ever thought that the knowledge of these things is perhaps a grace from God, of which He means you to profit?"

Instead of answering, "Mr. President" detailed the sufferings of his people: "We were in Omaha, twenty-five years ago, starving. I wrote for help to some of my fellow-bishops of your church, thinking they might relieve us."

"Did they send you anything, Mr. President?"

"Yes," he returned, in a hollow whisper; "they sent me twelve dollars and a half."

Then he expatiated on the wonders his people had done in the wilderness; how they brought seeds and agricultural implements over the mountain range,—all other pioneers did the same,—planted trees which grew, promoted agriculture by artificial irrigation. "This place was a wild mountain-slope; my people have made it what it is." The self-complacency and conceit of the Prophet surprised them; for, considering the time and labor expended on

it, they could see nothing remarkable in the progress of the Pink City of Zion.

He returned to the sufferings of the Irish, and said "they were like his own people"; they being the purest race on earth; his people, the most licentious! He had sent apostles¹ to them about the famine time, and after. He regretted they did not join the saints. They were good farmers. He had English, Welsh, Scotch, Americans; they were the only English-speaking people unrepresented among the Mormons. No doubt he knew well that if they wanted to barter their faith for this world's goods, they need not come as far as Utah. They did come, however, but not as disciples to his paradise. They are among the teachers, professors, merchants, miners, smelters, of Utah. And none are more highly respected in the Mormon country to-day than the bishop, clergy, sisters and other useful citizens of the nationality² he professed to admire.

The elders, in semi-circle on the platform, wondering, perhaps, what kept their chief so long, arose one by one, and advanced slowly until they were in close proximity to the party. Heretofore "the seer, prophet and revelator" had spoken in a low, confidential tone and in a subdued manner, but now he lifted up his voice and described his sufferings, "though loth to allude to them." He explained with fanatical energy the evil deeds of the Gentiles, and the simple, holy lives of his followers. Several times he lost the thread of the discourse, and the strangers could make no sense of his words, when to their relief he paused, after prophesying that the time of warfare would soon come. Calling one of his bishops, he dispatched him on an errand. He returned, with a yellow envelope, which he gave to his master, who handed it to the elder religieuse, saying: "Accept this; it may be of service to you, or you can distribute it among the poor at my old hunting-grounds near Omaha. I wish you would establish yourselves here to teach our young people. I want them piously raised."

The beneficiary thanked his excellency, and said: "We hope to hear soon of the erection of a church and of a resident-pastor in

¹ When Moore wrote his fine song, "The Irish Peasant to his Mistress," the "Mistress" being the Catholic Church, he would have been infinitely amused could he have looked into the future and seen a man, of Brigham's character, attempting to convert his country-people. The "Peasant" would scarcely have answered the strange apostle, but would address his "Mistress" in the impassioned words:

"Cold in the earth, at thy feet, I would rather be,
Than wed what I love not, or turn one thought from thee."

² On Sunday, February 9, 1890, one hundred gentlemen, of Irish birth, assembled at the Walker House, Salt Lake City, for the purpose of forming an Irish Legion and inviting their countrymen by birth or extraction throughout Utah to join them. Their president was the veteran, General O'Connor, who has been fighting for liberty in Zion for twenty-seven years. The victory of the liberals, February 10, 1890, was the Mane, Thekel, Phares, of the Mormons, who are doomed as a political power.

your city. Then, Mr. President, sisters will gladly come to teach your children." He sermonized on the importance of a good moral training, the bishops¹ listening with rapt attention. Finally, he asked, as a special favor, that the religieuses would step into his private office and sign their names in the Visitors' Book, saying: "I will value your signatures more than all the others on my records." They complied with his graciously-given request, and withdrew more eagerly than they had come, the high priest invoking blessings on them to the last, with great effusion and fervor. He remained under the portico, bowed again and again as they entered the carriage, and stood gazing after them as long as it was in sight. Certainly, nothing could be more reverential or gracious than his reception of them, and they took care to send him a message thanking him for the same. On reaching the hotel, they found that the yellow envelope contained twenty dollars.

Living in the Lion and Beehive houses were some nineteen women, whom the prophet euphoniously called wives. None of these appeared at the above interview. They were busily engaged as cooks, seamstresses, housekeepers, housemaids, and one grim-visaged woman kept school for the "Young" children. With the exception of one German and two English women, all the consorts of the prophet were Americans, several being from New England. Save the reigning favorite² who ruled Brigham for the time, these women worked hard; their wants and those of their children were supplied with a very frugal hand. In early days they were arrayed in cotton gowns and sun-bonnets. These were deemed too stylish, and if there could be anything uglier, in an æsthetic sense, he achieved it in the "dress reform" called the "Deseret Costume," which he planned and inaugurated—a short gown of linsey, a long, shapeless sacque of antelope skin, and a high, untrimmed hat, with a narrow brim. Even *his* despotic authority could not establish this hideous *mode*, and, after a season or two, it was seen no more. He was ferocious in his denunciations of feminine vanity. It was the text of many of his rantings in the tabernacle; but, being grasping and stingy, he preached nothing more frequently than retrenchment and economy.

Every subterfuge was resorted to to keep the Gentiles in ignorance of the doings of his families. It was well known that some of his children were bad, and others exceedingly disorderly,

¹ The hierarchy always spoke with enthusiasm of Brigham, and treated him with reverence, especially in presence of Gentiles.

² The person who ruled the dictator for the longest period, was Amelia Folsom, a native of Massachusetts, whom he "married," according to the Mormon rites, in 1868. He may be said to have discarded all the rest for this lady. He died at the elegant mansion he erected for her, called the Amelia Palace, August, 1877. "Miss Amelia" is living still at Salt Lake City.

haughty and arrogant. However, as has frequently been the case in Mormon families, more than half of his children, who were mostly girls, preceded him to the tomb. Nor were his cold, steely eyes ever seen to moisten when death took away any of the miserable mothers, or robbed the crowded nurseries of their babes.

Gentiles brought in the fashions, and the women of the Beehive discarded the sun-bonnets. Once, Brigham took an extraordinary freak of generosity. He actually went to a milliner, and ordered bonnets for his consorts. They were made and duly delivered, and, having examined them minutely, he expressed himself much pleased. When the milliner, a poor woman, presented her account, \$275, he returned her a receipted bill for the amount, which, he said, she owed the church for tithing! Great was her dismay, but there was no appeal from the dishonesty of the autocrat. He had always a great facility for taking advantage of his opportunities; the creditor cowered beneath his steady, unflinching gaze, and the shrewd, turbulent, illiterate Vermonter gained a victory, of which an honest man would be ashamed.

Among the public buildings was a wretched theatre lit with oil-lamps, on the boards of which the prophet's daughters and others acted. He had some histrionic and musical ability, uncultivated, of course, and was a clever mimic. Some of these qualities passed to his descendants; one gained some celebrity as an actress in San Francisco.

"All the women we saw," wrote one of the visitors, "looked broken-hearted. It seemed as if depression and sorrow stalked abroad everywhere. We were glad when the time came to leave the Pink City. Every day we saw women in the street, perhaps shopping. Each had with her from three to six or seven children; she carried the smallest, the others held on to her or to each other. There was no mistaking them for anything but Mormons. This sort of exhibition took place daily. Soon after, we heard that such displays were forbidden. The children had mostly light hair and fair complexions. Some of the women looked like Swedes and Danes; others were English, Welsh, Scotch, German. All dressed pretty much as emigrants from Northern Europe do when resting at Castle Garden, New York—long skirts, shawls, bibs, handkerchiefs on the heads. We heard there were Mormon schools, but did not see any."

All who have visited Salt Lake City have noticed the extreme plainness of the women. "I protest," wrote one, "that only in some of the *Crétin* villages of the Swiss mountains have I seen creatures in female form so dull, miserable, moping, hopeless, as the vast majority of these Mormon women." To use a harder and

more emphatic term, their ugliness is not merely negative, but positive. The writer has asked many persons what they thought of the Salt Lake women. "Oh, the fallow, wizened creatures! I never saw such women," is about one of the most complimentary answers received. This is the sad consequence of the iniquitous system that bears so heavily on the hapless women of the Beehive, destitute of happiness in the present and hope for the future. The sullenness or apathy seen in the face was very annoying to the saints, who boast of the happiness of the Mormon women, living like turtle doves in their snug nests in Zion. The sad experiences of a hideous life have carved deep lines about the eyes and mouth, made the faces hard and grim, and robbed them of the softness, tenderness, and grace which appertain to women.

Brigham's house—it could not be called home—was the best regulated in Utah, "a pattern to the saints." There were no servants. The women waited on themselves. Their time was spent in washing, cooking, mending, dairy-work. Each consort was supplied, in rotation and by weight, with necessaries. Later it was found more economical to have a general table. He dined with his families daily at the Lion House. Some seventy or eighty sat down to dinner, each mother being surrounded by her own children. Every evening, at 7, they assembled in the drawing-room of the same establishment to receive the benediction of the patriarch. If the women complained of their grievances, Brigham's remedy was "more work." He had often to scold and threaten. He advised them to "round up their shoulders to endure the afflictions of the world," and declared he "would rather go to heaven alone than have scratching or fighting about him." He protested he "would do something to get rid of whining women,"—all this from the platform of the tabernacle, before the assembled thousands, and where he knew they could not retort.

Brigham reproached these wretched creatures¹ for being unhappy, "wading through floods of tears;" the bitter jealousies and constant acrimony displayed in their galling lives annoyed him. Outsiders he received rather kindly at times; those of his own household he politely and affectionately termed "everlasting fools to complain of anything." And if he happened to be "too full of the spirit," the mildest name he had for some who had once been his idols, was "termagants." For their illnesses he had no sympathy. "They get sick to shirk work," he would say.

¹ If it was thus in Brigham's household, what was it in others? It may be asked: Why did not those wretched creatures endeavor to escape? Before the railroads came in, and for long after, it would be impossible to get away. The town was full of the spies of Brigham. Besides, to run away was to abandon their children and deprive themselves of a living, such as it was. And, as a rule, they had no means, and no friends to whom to go, and in any case they dreaded Mormon vengeance.

Fanaticism does not always teach patience. The "peculiar institution" engendered the worst passions in the human heart. Brigham professed to be able "to give the word of the Lord" on every subject, but he could never keep peace in his own mansions. Another luminary, Jedediah Grant, affirmed that, "if they could break asunder the cable of the church, there is scarcely a mother in Israel but would do it this day." But the tyranny of old has passed away for ever. Gentile ascendancy is now an assured fact. And it will be woman's own fault if she should not in future receive the position Christianity accords her, and which is her right.

A friend, resident in Utah, says that the Mormons are not up to the average in intellect; that their importations from non-Catholic countries are of a class whose intellect is little above that of the brute. According to Mormon teachings, they must obey the priesthood in all things. Their thinking is done for them, somewhat after the manner of Russian serfs. Physically, the Mormons are a muscular people; the animal prevails in every way. The proportion of deaf and dumb is greater than in the rest of the United States. And of lunatics, born in the Territory, the proportion was $10\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. in 1886 to $12\frac{1}{2}$ in 1887, in the State lunatic asylum.

There are several superior Catholic educational establishments in Utah. All Hallows College, directed by Marist Fathers; St. Mary's Academy, by the Sisters of the Holy Cross; a fine Academy in Ogden; another in Park City; hospitals in Salt Lake, Ogden, Silver Reef, and several schools, all founded by Bishop Scanlan.

On the Sunday prior to their leaving the holy city, the religieuses heard Mass, which was offered about 7 in the morning by Rev. Father Foley, in a log cabin about 30 by 17. He had to say a later Mass at Ogden. There were fifteen long benches or forms stretching the length of the room. About sixty men, many of them miners, and six women were present, most of them being of Irish birth. Everything about the humble church was as poor as the stable of Bethlehem. But the Adorable Victim was offered up to the Eternal Father, and the purest of Virgins was invoked. And the priest on the altar, and the religieuses who received from his hands the Bread of Life, were they not the "chaste generation" who feed on the "wheat of the elect and the wine that maketh virgins?" After Mass, the priest besought the great God to enlighten and bless the city, and make it, indeed, a holy city, and give to the dwellers therein light to know his will, and grace to do it. And when all knelt to offer the Rosary for this intention, the prayers of great, strong men, like the voice of many waters, were heard ascending to heaven. And who will say that these and many such prayers have not been gloriously answered, when the answer is

more than faith would ask, and can be seen and felt? The beautiful Convent of the Holy Cross, where every accomplishment is taught under the auspices of Mary; the fine College, where the youth of the Territory, when they ask for intellectual bread, will not receive a stone; the spacious, well-appointed hospital, where consecrated virgins assuage the anguish of every sufferer, whether Greek or barbarian, bond or free; the children of two religious congregations teaching the young in Zion itself; the bishop and clergy revered by a people who, in earlier days, would have stoned them, as well as by their own loving flock,—surely a glorious response to prayer. Verily, the finger of God is here. This is the change of the right hand of the Most High.

THE ENCYCLICAL "SAPIENTIÆ CHRISTIANÆ."

THIS latest encyclical of our Holy Father, Leo XIII., aims at bringing human life, in its private and its public relations, into conformity with the precepts of Christian wisdom. To the greater number of well-instructed Catholics it has doubtless seemed a plain, paternal exposition of very familiar truths. Yet few utterances of the great Pope have evoked so much hostile criticism from the Church's adversaries. Strange that there should be such a divergence of view concerning what may be called the common-places of Christian duty. It is an evidence that this lesson on Christian wisdom was not a work of supererogation; that there is sore need of looking to the fundamental principles of human conduct, if human life is to be kept from going astray and human society from drifting to disaster.

The encyclical may be summed up as follows:

The whole of man's life should be influenced by the consideration of his last end, which is God.

This is evidently true of man as an individual; it is, of necessity, equally true of man as a citizen, for between different sets of duties there cannot, logically, be an incompatibility. Civil society is not an end in itself; the interests which it guards and promotes are secondary to man's real destiny and should be directed thereunto.

A good citizen should be ready even to die for his country;

much more so for the Church, his spiritual country, the city of the living God, in which we are "fellow-citizens with the saints."

If temporal rulers assail the Church, they do wrong, and it is wrong to obey or abet them in their evil-doing. "We ought to obey God rather than man."

In our days, men absorbed in material pursuits neglect the spiritual, spurn the supernatural, scorn religion, and assail the Church. In this it would be shameful for Christians to co-operate, or even silently to acquiesce.

In face of these assaults, Christians should, in the first place, study thoroughly the doctrines of religion and their rational foundations, for nothing is so prejudicial to Christian wisdom as ignorance of it. Then, casting aside sloth and human respect, they should assert and defend the truth, by word and by example.

But, in order that individual zeal may not infringe upon the common order and the unity of the faith, all must be careful to speak and act wisely by speaking and acting in harmony with the Church, that is, with their bishops, and, above all, with the Sovereign Pontiff.

The Church, being the divinely appointed teacher of all nations, irrespective of their differences in race, customs and civil institutions, respects and honors all forms of government, asking only that religion and moral discipline be respected.

But no one must attempt to draw the Church into party strife, or to identify her interests with any fleeting form of political administration. When the rights of religion are assailed, Christians, whatever be their political differences, ought to unite for her protection.

The Church must desire that the spirit of the Gospel pervade all legislation as well as all life. Hence, if candidates for legislative or executive offices are known to be inimical thereto, the Church could not consistently countenance them, nor Christians vote for them. When men profess openly, as many now do, their hostility to religion and the Church, Christians would be sluggards or cowards who would not oppose them by every legitimate means.

Sin, error and dissension make a people miserable. Let Christians shun them and strive for virtue, truth and mutual charity and concord. And as the essential foundation of Christian society, let them carefully see to the Christian education of the young in Christian schools and in Christian homes.

Such is, in substance, this encyclical on Christian wisdom. Regarding man as an individual, it asserts spiritual duties and rights against materialism, and Christian truth against infidelity. Regarding man as a citizen, it asserts his right and duty to defend

by legitimate means the Christian religion and the Christian Church against all who unjustly assail them.

To minds destitute of religious belief and blind to spiritual realities, the whole argument of the Pope will, of course, be foolishness, his lessons and warnings an impertinence. With such men we have no controversy; we can only apply to them that word of our Lord: "Let them alone; they are blind." Catholics and all Christians have simply to see to it that the aggressiveness usually characteristic of infidelity be not permitted to trample on the rights of faith and conscience.

Very differently do we estimate the criticisms of Christian believers, whose anti-Catholic training naturally gives them a distorted view of Catholic teaching, and inspires them with mistrust of Catholic purposes and aims. With these we are not only willing, but anxious, for the sake of truth and charity, to compare views in all candor and all friendliness. We have no apology to make, for we know that our cause is that of truth and justice. But we have explanations to give and facts to present, which they need to hear who are not willing to judge unjustly.

These critics blame the Pope for advising Catholics to use their power as citizens for the defence of the Church and the advance of the interests of religion. They say that this aims at theocracy, and threatens the rights of non-Catholics. Let a brief, candid statement of Catholic principles and historical facts be our answer. For the sake of clearness, let us begin at the beginning.

Most of the current misapprehensions of Catholic teaching have for their source incorrect notions of liberty, right and law. We will first glance at these.

Man has the *natural liberty* to think, speak and act as he chooses; in other words, he has *free will*.

But man has not the *moral liberty* to think, speak and act as he chooses. His thoughts, his words, his acts, are subject to the moral law. He has *no right* to direct his intellect except to the true, nor his will except to the good. It would be absurd to suppose a right to what is wrong. Thus the difference between *free will* and *right* is manifest.

Next, as to *legal liberty*, we easily perceive that it cannot be as wide and unlimited as free will, since law and authority aim at hindering free will from encroaching on public order and individual rights. On the other hand, law and authority have their limits, since they can neither command all that is good, nor hinder all that is evil.

The limits of law and civil authority will necessarily be wider or narrower according to the circumstances of the people in question. In some countries, law must be content with protecting or

enforcing certain essential principles; in others it may go farther. In America, for instance, the unity of marriage is efficaciously protected; not so its indissolubility; Sunday-observance, in various degrees, is enacted as to external order, but not as to religious celebration. In general, when, in any country, a certain principle is generally admitted and held as important, this principle will naturally have the sanction of the law. But if the principle comes to be generally rejected or contested, then legal sanction will be inefficacious and inopportune, and will disappear, together with the institutions to which it may have given rise.

Now, in the estimation not only of Catholics, but of all consistent Christians, Faith, being the light which shows man his duty and guides him to his destiny, is a matter of supreme importance and necessity. Hence, he who tries to destroy faith in the soul of his neighbor, is more guilty than he who strives to harm him in person or property. This is a truth which no Christian can doubt. Let us, then, suppose a people generally and profoundly convinced of this truth; they will naturally demand of the public authority that this supreme good should, like inferior goods, be protected by the law. Such was the popular conviction in the Middle Ages. No wonder, therefore, that the laws provided for the protection of religious belief and morals.

To-day, the people of America are profoundly convinced that the unity of marriage is the foundation of society, and it is in conformity with this public conviction that laws have been enacted against the Mormons. Still more profoundly were the nations of Christendom in past ages convinced that the Catholic Faith was the basis of society; is it any wonder that they passed laws to foster it in the minds of the people and to hinder its being undermined or corrupted?

But, let us suppose a people among whom this general conviction of the essential importance of faith does not exist, from among whom it has gradually passed away; then its legal enforcement or protection becomes impossible, and no wise man will demand or expect it. Recourse must then be had to a system of mutual toleration. And this holds true of all matters of public interest. For example, the right of individual property has hitherto been regarded as essential to social order; but let us imagine a people among whom some form of Socialism has come to generally prevail, and, by the very fact, the legislation previously protecting the rights of property passes away, and the tribunals that have enforced it come to be regarded like the tribunals of the Inquisition.

As a system of intolerance is natural to a people strongly united in faith, so a system of mutual toleration and liberty is natural to a people divided in belief. The Church approves both the one

and the other system, according to the circumstances of the people; and not less sincerely does she approve the system of toleration among a divided people than she has approved the system of intolerance among nations quite united in faith. The acts of the sovereign pontiffs, not less than the teaching of the weightiest theologians, show that a system of religious liberty may be approved even among a people whose majority are Catholics; nay, that Catholics are allowed to bind themselves by promise and even by oath to maintain such liberty. It will suffice to cite a few documents of evident clearness.

The French Republic established full liberty of worship, and all succeeding governments in that country have guaranteed the same. This has not hindered the Holy See from permitting the bishops of France to swear fidelity to the government. (See Art. VI. of the Concordat of 1801.)

In Napoleon's oath of coronation were these words: "I swear to respect and to cause to be respected the laws of the Concordat and liberty of worship." Question was raised as to the meaning of this clause; but all difficulty was removed by the declaration that the oath to respect liberty of worship, and to cause it to be respected, was not meant as a judgment on religious truths, but only as a measure of civil toleration and protection.—(Dispatch of Cardinal Consalvi, August 30, 1804. See the diplomatic correspondence exchanged on this occasion, in the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, April, 1883.)

The charter granted by Louis XVIII. contained the following clause, Art. V.: "All profess their religion with equal liberty and receive for their worship equal protection." The question was raised in France whether Catholics could swear allegiance to a constitution containing this and other similar articles. The Holy See was consulted; the French ambassador declared that the king "had to assure to all his subjects the full exercise of their religion, and had guaranteed it to them by the charter and by his oath to observe the same; but that this oath in no way went contrary to the dogmas or the laws of the Church, he, the ambassador, being authorized to declare that it referred only to what concerned civil order." Upon this declaration Pius VII. authorized the oath of obedience to the constitutional charter and the laws of the kingdom, though embodying, as we have seen, the provision of equal religious liberty and freedom of worship.

At the same epoch was promulgated the fundamental law of the kingdom of the Netherlands, formed of Catholic Belgium and Protestant Holland. This law contained the following articles: "Liberty of religious opinions is guaranteed to all. Equal pro-

tection is granted to all religious communions existing in the kingdom. All the subjects of the king, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments." Here again difficulties were raised as to the licitness of swearing allegiance to such provisions; but these difficulties were removed when the government declared that, in swearing to protect all religious communions within the kingdom, protection was guaranteed only as to civil order, but with no intention of approving, directly or indirectly, their religious tenets.

The Constitution of Louis Philippe, August, 1830, provided like that of Louis XVIII: "All profess their religion with equal liberty and receive for their worship the same protection." Once more the Bishops of France consulted the Holy See as to the licitness of swearing allegiance to it; and although the Constitution suppressed the State religion and granted equal freedom of worship, yet Pius VIII. permitted the oath of allegiance to it, on the sole condition that it be clearly understood that the clause implied no approbation of doctrines, but referred only to what concerned the civil order.

The kingdom of Belgium was established in 1830. Its Constitution contains the following articles: "Religious liberty, liberty of worship, liberty to manifest one's opinions in any manner whatsoever, is guaranteed. No one can be compelled to take part in any manner in the practices or ceremonies of any form of religion or to observe its days of rest. Education is free; all preventive measures are prohibited. The press is free. All powers emanate from the nation." This Constitution, considered with reason the most liberal in the world, met with no opposition from the Catholics of Belgium; it met none from the Holy See. When, later on, some doubts on the subject arose, Cardinals Sterkx and Deschamps, Archbishops of Malines, demonstrated the licitness of the oath of allegiance. This attitude of the Belgian bishops was approved by the Holy See; and it is a well-known fact that Leo XIII. has most explicitly recommended the Catholics of Belgium to maintain and defend their Constitution. The following passage from the letter of Cardinal Sterkx so clearly answers questions raised and suspicions insinuated in our country to-day, that it is worth while to give it entire. He quotes from the Prince de Méan, Archbishop of Malines, who thus addresses the Belgian Congress in 1830: "The people whom you have been chosen to represent and to make happy are almost entirely Catholics; they have ever shown themselves devoted to the welfare of their country. In laying before you their needs and their rights, I have no thought

of asking for them any privilege; perfect liberty, with all its consequences, is the only object of their desires; this is the advantage which they desire to share with all their fellow-citizens." Then the Cardinal continues: "I make bold to predict, with no fear of being belied by events, that the Catholics will never ask for the suppression of the liberty granted to the dissenters. They could have limited that liberty in 1830; they could even have suppressed it entirely. If the thirteen priests who took part in that congress, with their numerous friends, had chosen to combine, they could easily have passed a system of intolerance. If they did not, it was because justice, charity, love of the public peace, loyalty, made it their duty to maintain the rights which the dissenters had acquired by long and peaceable possession. Now, it is evident that this duty will become daily more imperative, and that it will never permit the Catholics to exclude the dissenters from the enjoyment of the common liberties. Their religious convictions will always make them regard the dissenters as in error; but they must always recognize that the dissenters, as Belgian citizens, possess acquired rights to the enjoyment of their religious liberty. They will the more willingly acknowledge these rights, because the dissenters, though separated from the true Church, are not the less their neighbors and their fellow-citizens. It is therefore a great wrong to insinuate the fear that their liberties will some day be taken from them. Still less reason is there to fear that the Catholics will some day use to the injury of the dissenters the right of repressing abuses committed in the exercise of their liberties; for this repression must always be confined to acts constituting an offence against social order or the rights of others." These words of the noble Cardinal Archbishop of Malines are re-echoed by every Catholic of America to-day, in answer to the gratuitous and false insinuation that, if they became the majority of the American people, they would encroach upon the religious liberties of their Protestant fellow-citizens.

France, fertile in revolutions, published another Constitution in 1848. The preamble declared: "The republic must protect all citizens in their religion," and Article VII. was as follows: "Every one professes his religion freely, and receives from the state equal protection in the exercise of his worship." This Constitution occasioned no difficulty with the Catholics or with the Holy See.

This series of citations could easily be extended, but those here given must abundantly suffice. And to seize their whole import, it is necessary to recall the doctrine of the Catholic Church in regard to oaths. It is not allowable to bind one's self by oath to anything that is not *certainly licit*; a political oath must be given

in the sense of the power demanding it, without equivocation or interior reservation ; the oath, once taken, must be religiously observed. Now, we have seen that Catholics can swear allegiance to a constitution which guarantees to all citizens freedom of worship ; one thing only being insisted on, namely, that it is not allowed to confound civil toleration with dogmatic toleration or with indifference as to doctrines and approbation of error.

It is, also, to be borne in mind that in the Pontifical Acts above mentioned, it was a question of nations almost entirely Catholic, with but a small minority of dissenters, like Belgium ; it was the religious liberty of the dissenters that was guaranteed. Now, what is permitted in the case of countries almost entirely Catholic, is, *a fortiori*, permitted in countries where religious differences are more numerous, and where the dissenters form a larger proportion of the citizens. Hence Cardinal Manning's declaration in his reply to Gladstone : " If Catholics were in power to-morrow in England, not a penal law would be proposed, nor the shadow of constraint be put on the faith of any man. We would that all men fully believed the truth ; but a forced faith is a hypocrisy, hateful to God and man. If Catholics were in power to-morrow, not only would there be no penal laws of constraint, but no penal laws of privation."

As a practical conclusion and enforcement of this part of our subject, let it be noted that no instance can be shown, within this century of religious liberty, of a country where the Catholics, having come to power, persecuted the Protestants ; whereas, in Protestant Germany the Catholics have been subjected to persecution twice within fifty years. And in our own country, the example of Maryland must not be forgotten. On the 21st of April, 1649, the Council of Catholic Maryland passed the following statute : " And whereas the forcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in the commonwealth where it has been practised, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of the province, and the better to preserve mutual love and amity among the inhabitants, no person within the province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall be anyways troubled, molested or discountenanced for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof." Protestants flocked to Maryland and became the majority. They disfranchised the Catholics ; they proclaimed " liberty of conscience," but excluded from its advantages " Popery, Prelacy and licentiousness of opinion," and put in force a system of penal laws.

In the face of these undeniable facts, it is neither logical nor honest to assert that the " Four Liberties," as they are termed in

Belgium, stand in any danger from actual or possible Catholic ascendancy, or that any peril of the sort is menaced by the exhortation of Leo XIII. that Catholics, in exercising their rights as citizens, should not forget their duty as Christians.

"But," it is argued, "even granting that the Pope does not counsel encroachment upon the rights of Protestants, and that Catholics do not meditate any such injustice, does he not, however, advise resistance to laws which the Church considers contrary to her interests, and is not this an insubordination which no state can tolerate?" It seems almost incredible that such an argument could be advanced in the nineteenth century, and yet it is the staple of most of the adverse criticism passed on the encyclical. It might reasonably be hoped that, after the victory of conscience over despotism, of religious liberty over state domination, which was the triumph of Christianity over heathenism, no sensible man would be found to advocate state supremacy in religious matters. If anywhere the avowed enemies of religion come into power, and enact laws to enslave religion, violate conscience, and contradict God, can there be among the inheritors of the Christian martyrs any one to counsel blind obedience to their behests? And if, with his heart wrung by just such spectacles, the supreme Pastor of the Christian Church speaks to his children such words of exhortation as the fathers and mothers of the martyrs addressed to their sons in the days of old, is he blamable for so doing? And if, thanks be to God, times are changed, and Christians are able not only to die rather than obey laws against conscience, but to use their legitimate power as citizens to have those laws abrogated or amended, who that believes in liberty will blame them for so doing or censure the representative of religion who bravely encourages them to it? To cry out "*rebellion!*" in such a case, as the Italian radicals and others with them have done, is to side with those who long ago cried out: "To the lions with the rebels who refuse to burn incense to Cæsar and to Jove!"

Germany enacts the Falk Laws, sending to prison or to exile every bishop and every parish priest who will not swear to the religious supremacy of Cæsar, leaving at one sweep a thousand parishes without a pastor, and millions of souls without the ministrations of religion, because neither pastors nor people would fall down and adore the state-god. Can any one, not blinded by prejudice, be found to say that they ought to have obeyed Cæsar rather than God, to have humbly accepted state control over conscience and religion, just because the state demanded it? All honor to the Catholics of Germany for having viewed the matter differently and for having acted according to their reason and their

conscience! All honor to them for having stood up bravely for the rights of religious liberty, shunning both extremes of insurrectionary violence and of tame submission, and asserting their just rights in legal ways till they won the victory for conscience and for freedom! They present a spectacle in which not only the Church, but humanity, may well glory. They are a noble example to Christians elsewhere, who groan under persecution; and the Pope, instead of being blamable, is worthy of all praise for holding up the example to spur out of shameful cowardice or sloth the degenerate Christians who tamely submit to having religion insulted and to being robbed of their Christian inheritance.

In our country we have no fear that the wheels of our civilization will ever be so rolled backward that religious persecution will be attempted. Hence, from the depths of our hearts we proclaim our devotedness to her institutions and our trust in her future. But should it, by any possibility, come to pass that the old colonial penal laws against Catholics and Catholicity should be re-enacted, will any American, worthy of the name, dare to say that it would be the duty of Catholics silently to submit, no longer to practise their religion, no longer to teach it to their children, but submissively to acquiesce in the dictation of the party in power? We venture to consider this incredible; to believe that all true Americans will agree that it would be both our right and our duty to stand firm in conscience, and to use every legitimate means to oust the party of tyranny, to abolish the unjust laws, and to restore the reign of equal liberty. Such assuredly would be our course; and this is precisely what Leo XIII. counsels for countries where the advice is but too sadly needed. But we reiterate our conviction, that in our country, no matter how some fanatics may desire it and agitate for it, the good sense and the justice of the American people will ever render such a state of things impossible. Hence we keep calm while the fanatics rave, and are sorry if any sensible non-Catholics sympathize with them, and waver not in our trust that America will be, till the end, the tomb of oppression, the inviolable home of civil and religious liberty.

This letter of the Holy Father is a cry from a heart wrung with anguish at the contempt for religion, the disregard of conscience, the trampling on vested rights, the tyranny against the Church, which to-day disgraces much of what once was Christendom. This is a reaction from the spirit of faith to the spirit of heathenism. But it cannot last, because it is wrong and based on falsehood. Prejudice and passion cannot always blind men, nor even worldly interest lastingly prevail against the power of truth. The attempt either to coerce conscience or to disregard it, to treat the Christian Church as its Divine Founder was treated, to make the spiritual

order subservient to the material in the government of the world, to depose God from His throne and put the state-god in His place, must fail, must pass away as the last struggling remnant of heathenism and barbarism. It has reached a temporary ascendancy, because too many Christians become unmindful and unworthy of Christianity. But it is a usurpation of untruth and of violence, and it must pass. And they that now uphold it must pass with it into disgrace and oblivion, or return to the Author of our liberties, the immortal Prince of Peace. Of Him and His Church, and all who machinate against them, we can repeat the words of the psalmist: "They shall perish, but thou remainest. And all of them shall grow old like a garment, and as a vesture thou shalt change them and they shall be changed; but thou art always the self-same, and thy years shall not fail."

IS THE DREAM OF A UNIVERSAL REPUBLIC TO BE REALIZED IN OUR DAY?

THE throne of the Brazilian Emperor has been overturned; and the vast and rich country over which he held sway is now under republican rule and governed by republican institutions. No crowned head can now be found in America. The nineteen nations that occupy this continent, from dusky Hayti to our own brilliant galaxy of Anglo-Celtic commonwealths, are all republics. And with the exception of those territories, comparatively small and unimportant, where colonial dependence from Europe is still in existence—and even, in some instances, within the limits of the latter—no spot can be marked upon the map of the whole western hemisphere where popular government is not recognized, and where, at least in principle, if not in practice, the government is not administered in the name of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie may write with dithyrambic inspiration and high patriotic rhythm the well-deserved praises of "Triumphant Democracy," and the echo of his voice can be heard, with sympathetic ears, by all the rulers of this continent. No more masters in America! The people is sovereign, and the chosen individuals upon whom it has been made incumbent to administer the govern-

ment, to preserve peace and public order, to promote the public welfare, are simply delegates, temporarily elected for that purpose, nay, in fact, nothing more than paid servants.

Enthusiastic admirers of republicanism hastened to hail with loud acclaim the changed condition of affairs in Brazil. Resolutions of sympathy were passed, or introduced, in the different deliberative assemblies which happened to be then in session. Rose-colored expectations were cherished and expressed in buoyant language. And, as nothing in this world can be exempted from at least a touch of sadness, gloomy recollections have been awakened in some minds. It has been said that the soil of the New World and its special atmospheres are not congenial to emperors; and the tragedies of Iturbide and Maximilian, and the overthrow of Dom Pedro, despite his liberal ideas and education, and of the profound respect which his own personal character universally won for him in his country and elsewhere, have been cited as evidences of the general proposition. The ambitious Spanish soldier and the misguided and forsaken Austrian prince stained with their blood the ruins of the structure which they had endeavored to erect or to maintain; and the noble, aged gentleman, who, in calling unexpectedly at the humble mansion of a Spanish dramatic writer,¹ begged him not to change in the least his own ways, or the familiar tone which befits a friendly visit, because "the nobility of blood is no higher than the nobility of mind and intellect," wanders now, throneless and homeless, among the nations of Europe, driven away from his country, and prevented from sharing anything in its destinies, as if he would constitute a discordant element for which there is no place.

On this side of the ocean, it is said, the triumph of republican institutions is secured; it will be followed, they add, and shortly indeed, by further and greater triumphs on the soil of Europe.

The purposes of this paper are not, by any means, either to join in this exultation, or pass an adverse opinion upon it. No stronger condemnation can be made of personal governments than the one which Almighty God Himself dictated to His prophet.² Self-government, and liberty, and independence are things too necessary, too beneficial, too natural, too legitimate, to be in need of recommendation or applause, or to admit of unfavorable criticism.

If the Brazilian republic, as well as any other republic, succeeds in preserving internal peace, in improving the condition of the people, in furthering its progress materially as well as intellectually and morally, in preventing liberty from degenerating into tyranny, in securing the ascendancy of law over the dreams of demagogues,

¹ Don Manuel Breton de los Herreros.

² Kings, i., 8.

in treading with firm step upon anarchy and revolutionary methods, in never losing sight of the fact that God is, after all, the sole ruler, and that His kingdom is justice, and that this is the supreme aim and aspiration of the whole human race, *adveniat regnum tuum*, then, and, in that case, let it be welcomed heartily. Its establishment may be regarded to be a step forward, and in the right direction, on the road which all nations have to travel, in pursuance of the decrees of Providence, to accomplish the destinies which they have been called to fulfil.

It might happen, however, that a republic, even without falling into the hands of a dictator, or into those of certain reformers or tyrants who, under the name of presidents, rule with an iron rod, who understand freedom of conscience to permit of persecution of Catholics, of confiscating the Church's property, of suppressing religious orders, of forbidding public manifestations of worship outside the walls of the churches, or who, Nabuchodonozar-like, fill their countries with their own statues, and require absolute and unconditional submission on the part of those whom they improperly call fellow-citizens; then, and in that case, not joy, but grief, must be experienced.

The name of republic would, in this case, be a misnomer; and the people would find themselves in a still worse position than that which was predicted to the children of Israel when they, merely because the other nations were governed by kings, wanted to have one, and asked that he would be given to them. "Hearken to their voice," the Lord said, "and make them a king." "Hearken to their voice, but yet testify to them, and foretell them the right of the king that shall reign over them." . . . "He will take your sons, and put them in his chariots, and will make them his horsemen, and his running footmen to run before his chariots: and he will appoint of them to be his tribunes and centurions, and to plough his fields, and to reap his corn, and to make him arms and chariots, . . . and he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your best olive yards, and give them to his servants: moreover, he will take the tenth of your corn, and of the revenues of your vineyards, to give to his officers and servants, . . . your flocks also he will tithe, and you shall be his servants."¹

Everybody is aware that in more than one republic the president is master and the people are his slaves. Neither shall we discuss in this paper the question of republicanism in Europe. On this side of the ocean there are natural advantages, dependent principally upon the comparatively recent date of the discovery of our continent, which greatly favor the establishment and growth of a repub-

¹ 1 Kings, chapter viii,

lic. On the other side, on the contrary, there are obstacles, consisting chiefly of habits, of traditions, of social elements, which have become incarnate in the body of the nation, and either choke the seed of republicanism or make its growth imperfect.

They say that England and Spain, for instance, are marching rapidly towards the abolition of monarchy and the substitution for that form of government of republican institutions. But, with all respect for those prophecies, some doubt must be entertained, at least as to their prompt fulfilment.

Spain, it may be safely said, is far from being prepared for democratic rule. The days of 1873 are not far enough away to make us forget that that soil does not offer safe ground for any growth of this kind. Not to speak of the tendencies towards disintegration, socialism, and anarchism, which so prominently manifested themselves at that time, and caused the soldiers of Pavia, when dispersing the Cortes at the point of the bayonet, to be hailed as liberators, the fact remains, well proved, that all things Spanish, good as well as bad, will combine to cause the experiment to fail. Even the mere system of monarchical constitutional representative government has proved to be in Spain almost an impossibility, and, as a distinguished ecclesiastic and scholar (Don Juan Nicasio Gallego) used to say, three or four centuries have yet to pass before Spain can get settled and satisfied under that form of government.

As to Great Britain, it might perhaps be proper to repeat what that great son of the Church, Count de Montalembert, has said. In his opinion, the struggle between aristocracy and democracy, which is supposed to be raging and becoming more and more intensified in that country, is no more than the fancy of superficial observers. "In fact," says that distinguished writer, "the ruling power in England is practically vested in the middle classes, from which for centuries the aristocracy has been recruited, and which permits aristocracy to represent at home and abroad the public authority and the national greatness, as a powerful sovereign, confident of his undisputed majesty and strength, willingly allows his grandees to show off with great pomp in far away embassies, or aspire to the honors of public offices."¹

But, whether near or distant, whether desirable or undesirable, the triumph of democracy suggests to thinking minds an interesting inquiry: How far has it—if so it has at all—deviated from the laws of God? How does the Church of God look at it? How far is it consistent with Christian duty and with the rules of Christianity?

The enemies of the Church have often charged her with being

¹ *Un Débat sur l'Inde au Parlement Anglais*, par le Comte de Montalembert. London, 1888, p. 101.

inimical to liberty. It has been said that she is the right arm of potentates, who call the men "my people," and who think themselves entitled under a right which they, by their own authority, call "divine." Persecution, which has been called "emancipation," has been thereupon started against everything which has the stamp of Catholicity.

And prominent statesmen have been found in South America who, without the slightest hesitation, have proclaimed in loud tones that the cause of all the troubles in those countries is to be found in their religion, and that the day on which they signed the constitutions under which they were launched into independent life and declared the Catholic religion to be their religion, they signed thereby their death-warrant.

In looking at this argument with the proper calm, the doubt comes to the mind whether such strange blundering depends upon real ignorance of history, or natural blindness, or wilful misrepresentation.

Who can ignore the radical influence which the Church exercised, not only in changing the laws of Rome, which were, and are still to a considerable extent, the laws of the world, and rendering them day by day milder and more and more in harmony with all the ideals of charity, fraternity, equality, liberty to which humanity may aspire? Who condemned slavery? Who sowed the seed which, implanted in that most dreadful institution, radically poisoned its blood and its life, and discredited it, and antagonized it, and brought it at last to utter ruin and extinction? Who created that essentially democratic militia, otherwise called religious orders, who sided at all times with the people and protected them against the petty tyranny of the local lords and barons, and even against the bishops who exercised temporal jurisdiction and feudal rights? Who sowed the seed from whence the legislative assemblies, and the whole system of representative governments, afterwards sprang up? Who put an end to serfdom? Who made the workingman not only a man, but a power, and a power before which, indeed, not only the rich capitalist, but kings and emperors, had to bow respectfully? Who created, and organized, and filled with astonishing vitality those admirable trade-guilds of the Middle Ages which remained in existence everywhere in Europe until the days of the French Revolution, when the despotism of liberalism and the demon of centralization abolished them? Who has furnished the standard, the only one true and permanent and universally admitted, by which all institutions, all laws, all political systems, all things whatever, either public or private, in the life both of individuals and of nations, are measured, and pronounced just or un-

just, worthy or unworthy, favorable or unfavorable, conducive or not conducive to the happiness and welfare of mankind?

"Know ye, constant slanderers of the Church of God," said the illustrious Bishop of Orleans, Mgr. Dupanloup, in one of his celebrated pastorals, dated April 2, 1865: "Know ye, and remember well that while the Church reprobates license and wild outbursts of passion and excitement, she dearly loves human liberty; and she does so because, in the designs of God, who did not make man to be an imbecile slave, liberty is the foundation of all virtue, of all moral greatness, of all civilization, of all progress. The Church, which is the true mother of human civilization, and the maker of modern society, deplores and rejects and disapproves all that degrades man and hinders the progress of the human race. Mankind is God's especial care,—and the Church of God has to bless, as she does, whatever tends to redeem her, to lift her up, to place her in a condition as near perfection as possible."

A writer, of an entirely different character, but who, in an apparently superficial style, has said many good things about the United States of America, sets forth that he has often heard that liberty and the Catholic religion could not exist together; but that, in looking around him in these United States, he has found that the statement has no foundation in truth; because nowhere in the world is there more liberty than here, and nowhere, also, has the Catholic religion more vitality and is more flourishing.¹

The sermon which our great American Cardinal, His Eminence the Archbishop of Baltimore, delivered at his church in Rome when he took possession of his high dignity, might be sufficient by itself to establish, beyond a doubt, that the Catholic religion does not need any alliance with kings or emperors.

No word can be found in the "Syllabus of Errors Condemned," whose publication in 1864 so greatly enraged the enemies of the Church, which is antagonistic to human liberty or to democratic institutions. If, in paragraph LXIII, condemnation is made of the doctrine that "it is allowable to refuse obedience to legitimate princes, nay, more, to rise in insurrection against them," and reference is made to the Encyclical, *Qui pluribus*, of November 9, 1846, to the Allocution, *Quisque vestrum*, of October 4, 1847, to the Encyclical, *Noscitis et nobiscum*, of December 8, 1849, and to the Apostolic Letter, *Cum Catholica*, of March 26, 1860, the words "*legitimate princes*" simply mean "legitimate authority," authority legitimately constituted, that authority which, as the Apostle said, comes from God. "Let every soul be subject to higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those

¹ *Uncle Sam and His Farm*, by Max O'Rell.

that are, are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation."¹

This brings the question squarely down to what is called "divine right," which writers and statesmen of the Liberal school have so bitterly criticized. But the Apostle's rule does not seem to mean that a power, no matter how illegitimate, no matter how badly established, whether through crime or fraud, is legitimate, and comes from God, because it is a power, and that for this, and for no other reason, it has the right at all times, and under all circumstances, no matter what it does or what it commands, to be obeyed, or at least not to be resisted.

When the constituted authority of the Jewish people, "their rulers, and ancients, and scribes,"² were gathered together in Jerusalem, and caused St. Peter and St. John to be arrested and brought before them, and ordered them "not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus,"³ St. Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said to them: "Ye rulers of the people, and ancients, hear; . . . if it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye."⁴

Law and authority are one thing, and another thing is the *dictum* or action of a tyrant. Legitimacy and legality are not essentially identical. The standard of justice is not the standard of accomplished facts. And, while law is, and must be, sacred, and its authority is, and must be, divine, usurpation and tyranny cannot have the same attributes.

Of course, in this struggle between the divine authority of justice and law and legitimacy, whether in an empire or a republic; whether in a monarchical or in a democratic society—and the *de facto* power of a violator of justice and divine law, whether he is called an autocrat or a dictator, or is an oppressive minority, or a combination of unjust anti-Christian men, the Church cannot proclaim, nor has she ever proclaimed any other doctrine than that which prudence and wisdom, as well as justice, demand. The Church cannot preach injustice to counteract injustice. She cannot give her sanction to unlawful and unjust combinations to bring order where there is disorder, or to right what is wrong. She has to preach virtue, moderation, charity. She has to preach that prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance have necessarily to prevail and to conquer; and that no man can plunge his fellow-beings into the calamities of war and insurrection, unless it be in obedience to the will of God. Evolution, to use a fashionable word of our days, and not revolution, is the method most in

¹ St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, xiii., 1, 2.

² The Acts, iv., 5.

³ *Ibid.*, iv., 18.

⁴ *Ibid.*, viii., 19.

accordance with Christian principles and law, to redress social wrongs and cure social evils. Cast the seed of the Gospel to the four winds, and it, by its own force, will bring all things to their proper level.

But between this and the sanction of tyranny there is an immense difference. As there is a distinction between things *prohibita quia mala* and *mala quia prohibita*, so there is also a distinction between the authority which comes from God and the authority which comes from man. And it is for this reason that the "Syllabus of Errors Condemned," which we have quoted above, brands also with authoritative rebuke the doctrine that "authority is nothing else but the result of numerical superiority and material force." (§ LX).

A man can rise, and, like Alexander the Great, become, through force of arms, the master of the world. It may be said of him as the Holy Scripture says, with its usual sublime eloquence, when speaking of that conqueror, that the earth became silent before his presence—*et siluit terra in conspectu ejus*.¹ He may be like Antiochus, his successor in Syria and the adjoining regions of Asia, a tyrant of the worst type, an oppressor of the people, a violator of all laws. Could it ever be unlawful, and unjust, and worthy of censure to imitate those heroical Machabees, before whose glory few glories are not eclipsed, and do all things possible, no matter at what cost, to secure the triumph of justice?

Only one consideration might perhaps be in order in a case like that, and it is the one suggested by St. Thomas Aquinas. "The overthrow of tyranny," says he, "has not the character of a sedition, unless it is so untimely attempted as to cause the majority of the people to suffer more by it than by tyranny itself."²

"How was public power organized?" inquires Balmes. "Which were the stages through which it has had to pass? It is not different in this respect from all other great human facts. . . . Look at the formation of the modern states and you will understand that of the states of ancient times. Has Europe constituted itself under only one principle, which served her as a rule? Conquest, marriages, succession, cessions of territory, treaties, intrigues, revolutions, plebiscites, have they not been respectively the origin of public power in modern society? Force mixed up with right has presided over these arrangements. Even in our days are we not seeing constant changes of political forms and of dynasties, and revolutions, restorations, conquests, treaties, and a perpetual transformation of society, either through the influence of diplomacy, the action of an assembly, the force of the bayonet, or popular

¹ I Mach., i., 3.

² *Summa Theologica*, Secunda secundæ. Quest. 42, Art. 2.

outbreaks and commotions? This variety, these vicissitudes, no matter how much to be regretted, are inevitable. They depend upon the unceasing struggle which, by the very nature of things, all ideas, habits, and interests have to go through, and upon the greater or lesser excitement of passion, when mingling in the contention. Even that transformation which nations are constantly undergoing, some forward, some others backward, and all contributing their own share to the fulfilment of the destinies which God has assigned to the human race, while on their mission on earth, is a necessary cause of differences and an insuperable obstacle to be encountered by the foolish pretension that the facts of history, with all their immense variety, diversity, and amplitude, may be so fashioned as to allow themselves to be held within the narrow regularity of philosophical moulds. It is necessary to look at society from a high standpoint, and not to allow poor theories, purporting to explain and to rule the world, mere fables as swollen up by vanity, as deprived of truth, to dazzle our minds. In a word [says this illustrious writer], the object of public power is the satisfaction of a necessity of the human race; its moral worth and authority are founded upon natural law, which authorizes it and commands it to exist; but the mode of its formation depended upon circumstances, and has to be subject to the diversity and instability of human things.”¹

“Law,” says in another passage the same distinguished writer, “is the rule of reason and justice, an expression of eternal truth, an emanation of the Infinite Holiness and Wisdom. Under this point of view, law is of *divine right*; and those who have antagonized and criticized this epithet, and looked at it as an emblem of servitude, proved to have been exceedingly superficial and short-sighted, because of their failing to discover that on the contrary that divine right of the law is the only guarantee, and the surest of all, if other could be found, for the preservation of liberty.”²

This is exactly the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Aristotle of the Middle Ages, as Mr. Luz, of Cuba, used to call him, that high intelligence and really encyclopædic mind which honors the Church and the human race. *Omnis potestas a Deo*, it is true; but that does not mean that God has entrusted to a family, whether its name be Bourbon, or Hohenzollern, or Romanoff, the destinies of His people, or that He has prescribed any particular form of government. Reason, social interest, and circumstances of an entirely external character can only be invoked in favor of giving one particular form of government preference to another. Society cannot exist if all the members thereof are not kept together by a

¹ Balmes, *Elemental Philosophy*. Ethics, chap. xviii.

² Balmes, *Ibid*, chap. xxv., 206.

power superior to each one individually, whose duty it is to preside over the welfare of all. Therefore power is as natural as society, and as society and all that is natural comes from God, power comes from God.

According to St. Thomas, there are four kinds of law, or to put it perhaps more clearly, the law can be manifested under four different aspects. These are the eternal law, the natural law, the human law, the revealed law. Eternal law is the expression of divine or eternal reason, is the rule with which the divine wisdom governs the universe. St. Augustine had defined it *summa ratio cui semper obtemperandum est*: the supreme reason, or rule, which always all things have necessarily to obey. This supreme universal code enacted by the Almighty, by which He exercises His providence, is perfect and unchangeable like its author. Nothing escapes its action, whether in the life of individuals or in the life of nations. According to it empires rise and fall, families go on or become extinct, individual men are raised to honor or plunged into dishonor. No rebellion is possible against its *dicta*; what is provided by that law is as imperative and as much to be enforced instantly as is the sound of that voice which exclaimed: "Let there be light," and light was made.

Human intelligence cannot read all that is written in that law. Most of it is a mystery to man. Philosophers, both ancient and modern, have come in succession, one after another, and attempted inquiries into the economy of the world, whether in its physical or in its moral aspect. Physics and metaphysics, or things material and not material, have been freely discussed. And while from the most ancient days there have been men who advocated, perhaps much better than those of our days, the doctrines of evolution, and others which seem to be now the only standard by which the learning of a man is to be measured; others, from Plato to Montesquieu and Vico and Count de Maistre and all other investigators in what is called the philosophy of history, have endeavored to find out the secret of the life of society, the laws which it obeys in its multitudinous manifestations, and the cause of its rise and its decline. While some pretend to have found that there is a kind of fatality, this word being taken as synonymous with things inevitable, under which all nations have to go through certain stages, and pass, as man does, from childhood to manhood, and then to old age, and then to death; and others think that human society, no matter how constituted, has to move in a circle and come back at a certain day to the same point from which it had started; and others, that there is a line of indefinite progress which mankind has to follow, whether willing or unwilling, making always man's aim

“ That each to-morrow
Finds us further than to-day ; ”

there is always the universal belief, irresistible, entertained even if denied (because, as Count de Maistre says with great reason, “ the pride of man makes him believe that he does not believe ”) that there is a law, supreme, unerring, sovereign, above all, which all things obey, which is diaphanous as light to its Author, but of which human beings can catch but an imperfect glimpse.

The ancient Egyptians had erected a temple to a divinity which they called Neith, and represented the principle of life of the cosmos and of man. Her statue bore this inscription : “ I am all in all, the Past, the Present and the Future, and my veil hath no man ever raised.” So it is with the eternal law. No man has ever lifted the veil which covers it. He can only see the marvellous harmony which it causes to prevail. But when he attempts to explain it, if he is not blinded by pride, and calls himself a positivist, and refuses to see what is forcing itself through his eyes, no other way shall be left open to him than to do as Moses did when he saw the glory of God, to fall upon his knees, *curvatus pronus in terram*, and proclaim in humble reverence the supreme power of the Creator.

Whatever man can find written on his own conscience, and as constituting a natural element of his own existence respecting that law, is what St. Thomas calls natural law : *participatio legis æternæ in rationali creatura*. This law being, as it is, in conformity with the dictates of reason, and reason being one and the same for all men, there is no more than one law, as there is no more than one reason. Natural law is universal and unchangeable. Both attributes belong to it on account of its identity with the eternal law. It cannot be obliterated or erased from the human soul.¹ St. Augustine, in his “ Confessions,” had said, speaking of this law : “ Thy law, O Lord ! is written on the hearts of men, and iniquity has no power to blot it out.”²

Both laws provide for the establishment, preservation and progress of human society. In the admirable pastorals which our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII., when Cardinal Pecci, wrote for the Lenten season of 1877-1878, and which have been published under the title, “ The Church and Civilization,” it is explicitly stated that “ it is evident, and the least reflection will suffice to convince any one of the fact, that man was created by God for society, and so constituted that without society he could not possibly exist. . . . Society, then, being composed of men essentially capable of im-

¹ *Summa Theologica. Prima secundæ, quest. 94, art. 5.*

² *Confessions, i., chap. vi.*

provement, cannot stand still ; it advances and perfects itself. One age inherits the inventions, discoveries and improvements achieved by the preceding one, and thus the sum of physical, moral and political blessings can increase most marvellously. . . . Are not reciprocal relations (between men) vastly improved ? Has not the political system, in certain respects, improved under the influence of time and experience ? . . . It is, indeed, a fact that man in society goes on improving to the three-fold degree of physical well-being, moral relations with his fellows, and political condition. And the different degrees of the successive development to which men united together in society attain, is called civilization.”¹

The consequence to be drawn from these principles is not beyond the reach of any human intellect. There may be, as there are, among the nations of the world, a great many differences in the forms of government. There may be a personal ruler here, and a senate or an assembly there ; there may be a man or a woman sitting upon a throne, and called Majesty by the people ; or a fellow-citizen, our equal, and in many respects our servant, entrusted, both of them, with attending to the duties belonging to all executive powers, namely, to see that the laws are complied with, and through their enforcement that the life of society is preserved and its progress accomplished and fostered. All forms of government may be, therefore, good, and, under the circumstances, the most proper and desirable ; because politics is not a science of absolute principles, as said by Macaulay, but a science of compromises, and to a certain extent it might be said, with Pope :

“ For forms of government the fools contest,
The best administered is the best.”

But if the government, whatever it is, tramples down any principle whatsoever of the eternal or the natural law, that government is not right, is fully and absolutely wrong, and is doomed to destruction.

Positive law, as defined by St. Thomas Aquinas, is the law which each society has formed for itself by drawing consequences from the principles of natural law, and making application thereof to the requirements of life. This law is also a necessity of our nature and a condition of existence for the social order. Whether written or unwritten, whether codified or expressed by general consent and the decisions of the courts of justice, that law is entitled to the utmost respect, and no man must dare to change it, unless upon mature reflection and after long and calm deliberation. The object of law is to insure justice, and cause equity and the com-

¹ Cardinal Pecci, *The Church and Civilization*, 1st Pastoral, iv.

mon good to prevail ; and conservatism, in the true acceptation of the word, seems to be the best method even to undo the wrongs which the law may happen to do.

Revealed law, which applies to eternity, and is intended to secure the salvation of man, is, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, a law directly emanating from God, which goes as far beyond the nature of our faculties as eternity does—beyond the nature of our present existence, and is free from all errors, all fluctuations, all changes inherent in man. This law is necessary to complete the natural and positive law, because these two laws concern themselves with the things which belong to the natural and the social order ; that is to say, with things which fall under our natural faculties and regulate our relations with our fellow-beings, while the revealed law provides for other necessities and other destinies far above those relations.

Under the ideas which have been respectfully set forth, subject, however, to be withdrawn if authoritatively they are pronounced incorrect, it is easy to see the true meaning and character of divine right. There are powers and powers, some of them entitled to praise, some others whose existence is to be deplored. The standard for measuring them and drawing the line between the one and the other class is the law of God, the eternal and the natural law. "If now we bitterly deplore," said Cardinal Pecci, now Leo XIII., "the apostasy of governments representing social power, we cannot, however, ignore the fact that, besides the depraved official world that is without God, there is another real world in which there are many beneficent hearts, firm characters, and pure and lofty souls."

And to make it still plainer, the same great authority has uttered some phrases which now must be quoted, as a befitting complement of this part of the paper. "*Power*," the Church says, "*is from God.*" But if power is from God, it should reflect the divine majesty to command respect, and the goodness of God to become sweet and acceptable to all subject to it. Whoever, then, holds the reins of power, whether it be an individual or a community ; whether the functions be held by election or by birth ; in a democratic country, or in a monarchy, must not look to power for the gratification of ambition nor the vain pride of being above everybody ; but on the contrary he must seek the means of serving his brethren, even as the Son of God, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister unto others. . . . The kings of nations have strangely abused authority ; their covetousness was unbounded, and they satisfied it by devouring the substance of the people and the fruits of their labor ; their will was law, and woe to him who dreamed of escaping it. Not satisfied with this, they assumed high-sounding titles, which were nothing but cruel and solemn irony, when compared

with the reality. . . . The Church is represented as the foe to the liberties of man, and the most humble servant of every power on earth. You can now estimate the justice of these charges. The Church most assuredly has no approval to bestow on abettors of disorders, nor on systematic enemies of authority; but the obedience she inculcates finds a powerful recompense in the transformation of power which, having become Christian, . . . finds *its limits in the justice of its commands*. If these limits are overstepped by invading the domain of conscience, a voice is heard exclaiming with the Apostles: *God must be obeyed before all*. . . . Liberty is a flower that springs up spontaneously in a sphere of society that is guided by the spirit of the Catholic Church."¹

Under the circumstances above stated it may be perhaps easy to answer the question which suggested this paper. The dream of a universal republic has not much chance to be realized in our day, nor perhaps for a long time to come. Many a republic which is now in existence has either to undergo that Christian transformation which the eternal law provides, or to fall to pieces. Liberty cannot spring up within its limits and in its atmosphere; and liberty is the foundation of all morality and happiness. And while the transformation of society, and its becoming every day more and more Christian, and more and more in harmony with the teachings of the Church of God, shall end in securing the triumph of liberty and of popular forms of government, it will take no little time to be accomplished. As in the movement of a pendulum, the equilibrium will not be attained until after a series of actions and reactions, in exact proportion with each other, whether in intensity, duration, or any other character whatsoever.

The great aim of society is to secure that transformation, to become Christian, to attain as near perfection as possible, according to the standards of Christian law. The philosophers of the stoical school used to proclaim this principle: *Liberi estis, liberi semper estote ad servandum bonum, custodiamque ordinis*. Christian doctrine by the mouth of one of its greatest expounders, the immortal author of the "Following of Christ," put it still more forcibly: *Negotium nostrum . . . quotidie seipso fortiori fieri*. To become stronger and stronger every day is our business, our aim. Stronger to struggle against the evil, whether within ourselves, or in the external world; stronger to aid in the triumph of justice; stronger to secure emancipation from everything which degrades, or abridges, or oppresses, or prevents from being shown in all its brilliancy, the dignity of a creature which was made in the beginning to the image and likeness of God, and which even in its fallen condition is "little less than an angel."

¹ Cardinal Pecci, *The Church and Civilization*. Second Pastoral, chap. vii.

AUSONIO FRANCHI—THE GREAT ITALIAN PHILOSOPHER'S NOBLE REPARATION.

Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi. Milano, Palma. 1889. Pp. 680.

“**K**NOW thyself!” is an apothegm no less wise than pithy. Know other men! if a less pithy saying, is not less wise. Probably there is not one man of all that live or have lived from whom we may not learn. Two, at least, there are, widely separated by time, experience and temperament, from whom those who would know others and themselves will ever seek instruction, courage, spirituality, and through whom many shall receive the priceless gifts of faith, hope and charity. Augustine and Newman, in the “Confessions” and the “Apologia,” have left us two mirrors wherein we may see the reflection not of two souls only, but also of our own soul and of other souls unnumbered. To the sensitive man, who has estimated the comparative measure of his ideals, a confession to the crowd, not of crimes, but even of the interior struggles of the soul, is much more painful than bodily punishment. Who goes farther, for the sake of conscience, from a sense of obligation to his fellows and to God, and humbly, regretfully acknowledges past evil-doing—how great his trial and his merit! The Augustines have been few in number, nor dare we lift up even penitents above the ordinary to his high level. And yet we may claim that believers and unbelievers will find in the “Confession” and in the reparation of Ausonio Franchi a lesson whose value is not to be impaired by a comparison that would establish the inferiority of his talents, of his aspirations, or of his influence, to the talents, the aspirations, the influence of the great bishop of Hippo or of the great English cardinal.

Life is a trial, longer or shorter, of some men's bodies, and of other men's intellects. Who shall say that he is strong above his fellows? The man who is not inordinately greedy, or who is just ordinarily sensual, and whose faith has never been disturbed? As though pride did not lie close-coiled under zeal, under piety, under knowledge; and as though pride's painless fangs did not secretly poison hearts that would be honest, minds that would be right, tongues that long to teach the truth. Certainly when Cristoforo Bonavino entered the seminary, determined to give his life and talents to the service of God and men, in the sacred calling of the priesthood, he lacked neither zeal nor piety. When, years after, he laid his hand upon the Gospels, on the morning of his

ordination, his zeal had not diminished, though knowledge had been added unto zeal. And yet, a consecrated priest, freely bound, fairly tried, past early youth, he did lose faith, revolt against divine authority, forswear himself, and turn his hand against the spiritual mother that gave him his true life. With his cassock, Cristoforo Bonavino laid aside his family and baptismal name, and the world of letters, the world of sophistry, the politicasters of the revolution, welcomed the new Ausonio Franchi, who was henceforward to lend his talents and his learning to the cause of rationalism and revolution.

To say that it is never too late to repent is to repeat a saying that would be trite were it not Christ's saying. Forty years and more have passed since Ausonio first betrayed Cristoforo. At length Ausonio has repented; better still, he has made a reparation,—a noble reparation,—whose effect, however silent, will be immediate, far-reaching, permanent. He has indicted himself at the bar of conscience, of philosophy, of science, of history, of experience; convicted himself publicly before all men, and confessed his faults heartily, humbly, with compunction. A man can do no more. Without God's help no man can do that much. The sacrifice is one not granted to meaner souls.

We can know something of a man from his style, and so natural is Ausonio's that a page of his book discloses the mind and the heart of the writer. Not only does he open his soul to us, giving us thereby an insight into many a passionate heart and erring mind, but he also teaches writers, who would do good, a lesson in the value of a finished style. Ausonio's style is masterly, and we know how he made it so. There is only one way. "With age," he says, "I have become more and more severe with myself. I mistrust myself more and more. I dispute with myself about each phrase and each word, and if in youth sometimes a whole day's study hardly sufficed me to compose a single page, in these later years very often I find that at the end of a day I have not finished, and, perhaps, not even begun a single sentence."¹ If Ausonio's habit of writing were generally adopted there would, of course, be a panic in the book-printing business, but what good books we should have in our conveniently small libraries!

By nature and training an artist, Ausonio is at the same time a practical as well as a theoretic philosopher and a man of his day. A thinker, a student, he is gifted with a sensitive nature, open to the most delicate and the most powerful emotions. Keen of vision, bold, high-spirited, he is at the same time patient, warm-hearted, merciful, reasonable and a reasoner. He is a philosopher

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 10-11.

who remembers that men have hearts. When you have laid down his book you feel that he has enlivened, strengthened, elevated your heart. Temperate himself, he has tempered your rising anger; just himself, he has awakened your righteous indignation; high-minded himself, he has enlarged your aspirations; experienced in men and affairs, learned in the history of human thought, he has informed your mind with knowledge, eminently practical and timely. But he is here to be judged, let him speak for himself.

With an enthusiasm not uncommon, and with a want of judgment only too common, Cristoforo Bonavino, in youth, devoted more time to the reading of German "criticism" and French "positivism" than to the serious study of Christian philosophy. His education, his entrance into public life were influenced by the remarkable political movements of 1848. Gioberti had crazed well-meaning Italians, comforted the souls of rationalists and radicals, and given a sort of cowardly courage to shop-keeping "liberals." The watchword of the day was that Italy must be re-made, the tyrants thrown down. She, whose "primacy" was so easily established by the aid of fine phrases, must be free. Who were the tyrants? The Church and the State—not Piedmont, of course. Piedmont was appointed to save Italy. Down with theological dogmatism and political despotism! "Then," writes Ausonio Franchi, "lifting up once again the cry of the eighteenth century, and the banner of its fighting philosophy, we declared war on the two authorities that, according to us, had conspired to hold us in spiritual and temporal slavery; a war, all the more fierce and implacable, because of our high estimation of the benefits we were deprived of, and of the magnitude of the evils we suffered, through these two powers that prevented Italy from becoming a nation, and Italians from having a country. I was one of those who could use no other arm than the pen, and with this arm I, too, made war against the 'dogmatic' authority of the Church and the 'despotic' authority of the State. My campaigns were my books; but books thus made are necessarily works of negation and destruction, whose scope and office it is to show that certain doctrines are false, and certain institutions iniquitous; and to persuade, invite, excite readers to repudiate the one and to abolish the other."¹ How to replace the good things that passion repudiates and abolishes, passion will consider—when passion is in chains.

Ausonio was surprised, though it was not surprising, that he gained applause from many, and from unexpected, quarters. "Skeptics and atheists, empirics and eclectics, materialists and spiritualists, theists and pantheists, constitutionalists and radicals,

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 41.

saluted the author as a fellow-worker in the good cause."¹ All the enemies of "dogmatism and despotism," however divided as to the end or the means, were united in the lodge of "reason and liberty." More advanced than Gioberti, Ausonio adopted the revolutionary ideas of Mazzini, and, having satisfied himself of the unreasonableness of Christian "dogmatism," he sought a solid basis for human reason in the *Critique* of Kant. To the influence of the sophistical German the world owes Franchi's more important works, *La Teorica del Giudizio*, *La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane* and *La Ragione*. More logical than Kant, he criticised away the very idea of God and was perfectly satisfied with himself. He had solved his own problem with so great ease.

To God Padre Bonavino owed two splendid gifts, two rare gifts. He was born with the mind and the heart of a teacher; and a teacher the new-made Ausonio was, as well as a polemist, from 1852 up to 1860. In the latter year Terenzio Mamiani, who had philosophized himself into the position of Minister of Public Instruction, appointed Franchi to the chair of the History of Philosophy in the University. Mamiani was a moderate, Ausonio a comparative irreconcilable. Perhaps the minister's motive was not at all political. The appointment may have been due wholly to Mamiani's respect for the ability of the ex-priest. Neither the new professor nor the friendly politician could, however, have foreseen the consequences of the appointment.

All men teach, though few, relatively, know that they would be justified in prefixing the sounding title of Professor to their conventional name. And yet, few men, and, perhaps, fewer professors, deserve the office to which nature has indiscriminately appointed the sons of men, or the title which so many ambitious, greedy, conscienceless, and so many most worthy, men assume, or gain, or earn. Ausonio Franchi has recorded his experiences of the modern Italian school-teacher and professor, and of that new science of pedagogy, to which so many bearded and beardless innovators are only too ready to sacrifice their self-esteemed talents in the interest of place and of pocket. Programmes, text-books, methods of teaching, scientifically-shaped chairs and, above all, the increase of magisterial salaries,—these questions, Ausonio testifies, are always in the "order of the day;" but, beside these you will find not one of the themes that really have to do with the essence, the life, the soul of pedagogy. Who troubles himself about the acquirements proper to a teacher? About the special duties incumbent on him? About the virtues of which he should be the true model in the school, in the family and before the public?

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 41-42.

About the vices and defects that he particularly should avoid? About the best system of rewards for good teachers, and of punishments for bad teachers? ¹ When these subjects, that lie at the root of all true education, are wholly neglected, shall we be surprised when we see men build up a pedagogic science of quackery, whose basis is a vain and sterile formalism; a false, mechanical, wholly external apparatus—vain, sterile, false—“because it is not informed by a moral and religious faith in the arduous, noble and sacred apostleship of education; because it is not vivified by a fervent zeal, tireless in exercising and perfecting that apostleship, as the one aim and the supreme duty of life?” ² Formalism! Mechanical apparatus! A moral and religious faith! A sacred apostleship! Is this a covert attack on our splendid modern system of go-as-you-please, state-certificate, education? Or, can we pardon a man of seventy for having learned something of contemporaneous methods, even if he has had no experience other than that of a professor of philosophy? Let us hear Ausonio, as he develops his thoughtful experience: “In pedagogy, science and art play the smaller part; the great, the greatest factors are morality and religion. The best master is not he who is richer in talent and learning, but he, above all, who, with a training that fits him for his grade, has a love, a passion for teaching—the man who lives only for his scholars, and whose thoughts and affections centre in the success of one and the progress of another—this the object of his desires and his hopes, the peace of his conscience, the happiness of his life. *There is the science of sciences and the art of arts; there, the whole secret of pedagogy!* Filled with such a love, with such a passion, the teacher will ever find in his fatherly heart, in his religious spirit, a sagacious, active guide, that will safely direct his course and supply the deficiencies of the programmes, text-books or methods, forced upon him by incompetency, or selected by his own mistaken judgment. Without such a love, there is no method, no text-book, no programme—there is no art, no science—that can ever make a good teacher or a good school.” ³ When a man feels himself stifled in the corrupted atmosphere of quackery and formalism, with what a nervous sense of joy he welcomes a breath of pure air! Would that the words we have so poorly translated could be read by every man and woman in the land!

There are “vocations.” A thoughtless or a deliberate abuse of a calling cannot be used as an argument against Providence. Of Padre Bonavino’s qualifications for the calling of a teacher there can be no doubt. “Teaching was always his passion, his delight.

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 15.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16, note.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 16, note.

In no state or profession could he have enjoyed the contentment, the happiness he experienced in living solely for the children of a primary school, or for the youth of an academy or of a university."¹ We can readily imagine Ausonio Franchi's pleasure when he was chosen to instruct the students who frequented the venerable halls of Pavia. His pupils are still affectionately, gratefully mindful of him, and Padre Bonavino loves them with the love not alone of a professor of philosophy, but also with that deeper love of a priest who is once more a true shepherd. "Most heartily do I here avow," he writes, "that my indebtedness to them is much greater than their indebtedness to me. To them I owe, if not the first, certainly the strongest impulse, the most helpful direction, on the road that led me back to safety."² For years he had been a writer of that kind of philosophy which is called "popular," because it is flung at the public. Padre Bonavino has the measure of such a writer, who "addresses the public just as if he were speaking to himself, giving free rein to the audacity of his thought and to the fury of his passion." It was after this manner that Ausonio Franchi philosophized, up to the year 1859. "But, when he had to speak from the professor's chair, he felt himself bound, not by the laws of the State, or by the regulations of the ministry, but by a sense of conscience, to practise liberty of speech with an especial caution. For the relations between pupil and teacher are almost those of father and son. As the pupil is obligated to learn what the professor teaches, so the professor is bound to teach not his own opinions, but the things that science has generally recognized as true and certain. And, as to opinions more or less probable, but which are still disputed, or disputable, while the teacher should expose these, historically and critically, he should beware of giving forth, as the conclusions of science, the hypotheses, conjectures, novelties, the charlatanism of this or that school; above all, he should rigorously avoid the use of a single word that might pervert or offend the moral conscience. The teacher assumes the place of the father, and has, like him, *a care of souls*. He should deal with his pupils as if they were his own children, and have at heart their virtue as well as their knowledge. Never should he say anything that the pupils should not believe; never should he do any act that they should not imitate."³ Many chairs of so-called science would be speedily vacated, if the consciences of all so-called teachers were guided by the just principles laid down for himself by Ausonio Franchi.

Though persuaded of the truth of rationalism, Ausonio did not feel that he could teach its doctrines to his pupils. He was learned

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 8.

² *Ibid.*, p. 264.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

enough to know, and honest enough to recognize, that these doctrines were not so universally accepted as to deserve a place in the "common patrimony of science." Evidently, they were not certain. Were they so founded in rectitude as to be safe guides of moral conduct? Of this he had no security. Should he, then, run the risk of scandalizing his pupils? The answer was a prudent, honest No. Thenceforth, he determined that he would avoid all religious criticism, and scrupulously respect the creed of Christianity. "One motive, more than any other, fixed me in this determination," he says, with a charming simplicity, "the countenances of those dear youths who hung upon my lips, who trusted my words, who laid open their minds before me, in order that I might illuminate them with my thoughts, and their hearts in order that I might warm them with my affections. To sow or cultivate in their souls a doubt of the principles of theism, or of Christian spiritualism, and consequently of the principles of moral and social order, would have seemed to me as repugnant, as horrible as the idea of a conspiracy or of treachery." Hesitation compelled reflection. Conscience appealed to the reason. Could a system that was practically illicit be theoretically true? To answer this question was to force rationalism to demonstrate its reasonableness. "And as the question was naturally connected with the history of philosophy, it became thenceforth the centre of all my studies and abilities, the one anxious, trying care of my life. Year after year I was diligent in collecting, debating, valuing, weighing old and new reasonings for and against. Day by day the opposition gained, the defence lost, in weight, until at length there was nothing on one side, and everything on the other. For me, the question was answered, and to the consequent question there came no other answer than a short and sharp No."¹

"And this NO, which repudiates rationalism, seems to me much more valid and legitimate than the YES with which I espoused her. For, that YES was the ending of a contest that lasted five or six years (1846-51), in the hot days of youth, during the tempest of revolution, which had disturbed, convulsed, minds and consciences even more than cities and States, while this NO is the conclusion of an examination continued for more than twenty years (1866-87), in mature age, with a calm mind, amid the quiet of the study and the school. And since the occasion which, above all, determined me to repeat, to carry on and to complete this examination, was love of my pupils, I can now justly affirm that they did me more good than I can have done to them, and the depth of my gratitude is such that it cannot be expressed in words. It is

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 265-6.

a feeling which may be summed up in the habitual, loving wish of the father's heart : God bless them ! ”¹

We shall be pardoned this long quotation, on account of its beauty, its sincerity, its tenderness and, still more, on account of the valuable lesson it conveys—a lesson in the science of other men's souls. Among the wonderful mysteries that crowd upon us, not the least insoluble is the mystery of the hidden agencies that move the mind toward truth, or away from her. How many live and die the victims of passionate unreason, satisfied that they alone are calmly reasonable ! How few hot heads, or cold hearts, ever measure the scientific, or the moral, value of the opinions whose consequence they know to be the destruction of the patrimony of science, of the principles of Christian spiritualism, and practically, therefore, of moral and social order ! How many teachers love themselves, and do not love their pupils ! How few take even five years, at any period of life, to test their own or other men's arguments : to debate, value, weigh the doctrines that may be false, ruinous, and that, being so, are as horrible as the work of damned traitors ! It is well to remember that a rationalist may compel from the unwilling lips of a pupil, who has at length reasoned himself out of a lifetime of falsehood, words much less filial than the moving “God bless him !”

The quotation has not only given us in few words a summary of a long chapter in the life of Ausonio Franchi ; it has, in addition, permitted us to estimate the value of his present work. A rationalist whose honesty is unimpeachable, and who can point to a record of thirty-six years of unbelief, and to twenty-one years of studious, learned, critical inquiry—not the inquiry of the hired platform mountebank, or of the magazine philosopher who is filled with the learning of the cyclopædia and of the popular scientific manual, but the inquiry of the trained logician, of the scholar, read in all the schools of all times, and whose talents and acquirements are such as to command the respect of the most learned—such a rationalist is not to be dismissed by his former co-workers with a sneer. His testimony against himself is worthy of more than passing attention. Men who value truth for truth's sake will not be satisfied until they have reasoned with him. The value of his book will not end with this century. He has written a chapter in the history of philosophy—a chapter that will compel the attention of believers and unbelievers.

Ausonio Franchi donned the weak armor of the rationalist, and entered the philosophical lists, in 1852. His title and claims were inscribed in *La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane*, a book so well es-

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 268-9.

teemed in its day that Italian rationalists, in search of a name for a "philosophical" magazine, could find none more fitting than that chosen by the ardent ex-priest, who, with a light heart and head, started out to teach wisdom to wiser men. There have been gifted souls who, after a long life of study and experience, imagined they were beginning to know themselves, on the very day before impetuous death rushed in. Ausonio is one of the thousand of million examples of the man who supposed he understood himself and the world, when he had attained the ripe greenness of thirty and odd years. Bertini had gathered together, in his *Idea di una Filosofia della vita*, "the capital doctrines of metaphysics, commonly taught in the Italian schools up to the middle of this century." Ausonio proposed to apply the criticism of Kant to these same doctrines. He did not intend to deny these doctrines on the ground that they were false, but solely on the ground that they were not "philosophical"¹—an old distinction, whose history Ausonio has since traced, and found, as inquiring rationalists—if such there be—may readily find, that it is much more difficult to be erroneously original than it is to be philosophically right. Kant appealed to confused minds, with an irrational distinction between those doctrines which, according to him, were not demonstrable by reason, and which, therefore, should be eliminated from the sphere of *pure reason*, and those same rationally undemonstrable doctrines which, being psychologically and morally rooted in the very life of the human intellect and heart, were to be maintained in the name of *practical reason*. Ausonio was prepared, so he imagined, to riddle the ordinary proofs of the absolute reality of God, of the contingent reality of the world, of the spiritual reality of the soul, and quite as well prepared, on the other hand, to establish, on the most substantial foundation, the natural verity of the self-same theses. To-day he confesses his failure, absolute failure. After thirty-seven years of incessant study, after thirty-seven years of experience in private and public life—an experience which permitted him to observe closely the mental, moral, political and civil effects of many theories that have since passed from the smoky realm of abstraction into the clearer realm of fact, he sadly exclaims: "How grievously did I deceive myself! False hopes! False previsions! In the words of the wise man: 'We wandered from the way of truth.' Instead of eliminating science and thereby exalting faith, I succeeded in abolishing the one and the other. Unbelievers I could make, but not one believer."²

Emmanuel Kant was sixty-four years of age when he published the second edition of his "Critique of Pure Reason." In the

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 54.

² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

preface he announced his age, certainly with no intention of weakening his magisterial authority. His method, he declared, was the only one fitted to completely eradicate materialism, fatalism, atheism, incredulity, idealism and skepticism. The Italian pupil who, not half his age, pinned his faith to the famous German's "mature" system, has measured its effects, and the pupil's judgment—now more matured than was the master's—is that not only did Kant's "Critique" fail to excite a belief in God and in the freedom and immortality of the human soul, but that it generated a mighty crowd of atheists and materialists, infidels and skeptics, not only among the learned, but among the young men and the young women of all the classical, technical, normal and professional schools.¹ "Only the malignant dare deny Kant's honesty of purpose," says Ausonio. And yet what a terrible lesson this practical criticism by an experienced pupil conveys! Evidently a man may be honest and blind; and honest blindness may mislead the souls and corrupt the hearts of men innumerable.

The harm that Ausonio Franchi did he has labored to undo most thoroughly. Taking in hand the *Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane*, he reviews it, sentence by sentence, phrase by phrase, word by word; criticizing his former positions with consummate dialectical skill; exposing the minutest error expressed in his early rationalistic sophisms; refuting his own objections; disproving his own premises; invalidating his own conclusions. Nor does he stop there. Having convicted himself and rationalism, critically, he proceeds to demonstrate the truth of the theses whose validity he at one time contested so unphilosophically. This self-refutation has a double value. It is an answer not merely to the argumentation that he directed against Bertini; it is, at the same time, a refutation of Kantism. The "Critique" that Ausonio tried and found wanting, he has more especially criticized in the two chapters devoted to the question of "the existence of an absolute Being," and of "the notion of an absolute Being."²

We have not had to wait until 1889 for a refutation of Kantism. Five centuries before the clever German, and a great many other less clever men, had assumed that his intellect was more than angelic, St. Thomas, summing up the science of reason and faith, had disproved the imaginative ratiocination by which Kant was misled, and by which he misled so many others. A "progressive" mind, that is not more than five centuries behind the rear-guard of truth, deserves a forward place in the van of conventional "modern philosophy." Ausonio Franchi learned this fact as he progressed, rationally, from unbelief to faith. To bring men back

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 65.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 381-473.

by the road he came, he adopts, however, not the method of St. Thomas, but a method which many with him will deem better suited to the last decade of the nineteenth century. Truth does not change her person. On this account, perhaps, there is a tendency, among ascetic minds, to argue that she should never be dressed according to the fashion of the day—as though pleasing apparel could make her less acceptable to men of taste who are not necessarily devoid of reasoning faculties. When she is presented to students of philosophy, Ausonio is of the opinion that the “critical” garb sets her off more becomingly than the old-fashioned “theoretic” costume. The latter may be the more correct, but in these matters the audience and the lecturer deserve consideration. In the time-honored, unornamented clothes of demonstration, the goddess has a repellant air of dogmatism, while in the newer, fresher, gayer robe of criticism she seems to be more pleasing, more gracious, simpler, less severe, more human, and, above all, more original. “A theoretical treatise about any question of philosophy,” says Ausonio, “(except in those very rare cases where the author has a healthy genius of invention or innovation), is, at most, a compilation in which things said by other men, and often by masters, are repeated again and again. I shall not deny that works of this class may be highly meritorious on account of the new knowledge they contain, or on account of the clearness, order, precision, correctness with which they re-state other men's work. Still they are always, substantially, second-hand books, serving those who use them much more than they gratified those who fatigued themselves writing them. In the controversial (‘critical’) method, on the other hand, the author is as personal as if he were engaged in a conversation with his opponents, and, whether he bear himself well or ill, he is responsible. In the apprehension, discussion, acceptance or rejection of the arguments of others, he puts his own talents, his own knowledge, to the proof; a proof all the more serious and hazardous because he speaks to men whose eyes and ears are wide open, intent on catching him at fault, and ready to attack him with sound reason; and, on the other hand, a proof more conformable to the disposition of the writer who would rather be conquered in the philosophical arena, through the weakness of his own powers, than be a victor through the aid of others.”¹ Now that a few bold Catholics have risked the treatment of philosophical questions in the most living language of the day, the smaller number who have dared to deal with these important subjects in a critical, controversial, conversational manner, may be encouraged by the testimony of a writer who addresses various

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 45-47.

classes of readers. There are students who imagine that they are fully alive only when they have read the books of dead men. And yet the sons of dead men occasionally are compelled to live after their fathers have been buried.

A quotation in which he sums up his earlier rationalistic argumentation and Kant's, will give a notion of Ausonio's method, and a valuable criticism of Kantism by an adept. The "Critique" of Kant, "instead of being a system which, more than any other, can satisfy *pure reason* and *practical reason*, is a mixture of sensism and idealism that, in the end, avails to deny the cognition of every reality and the reality of every cognition. In other words, it resolves itself into a subjectivism that is worse than any skepticism, inasmuch as it condemns the human reason to be naturally incapable of knowing the truth about anything, because naturally disposed to accept the illusions of the imagination as real things—that is to say, it declares the human reason to be naturally, perpetually, incurably in a state of hallucination."¹ Such a system is not only illogical; it is also immoral. It implies the negation of Christian theism. "Now, this theism being denied, the only one which is conformable to, or which is not contrary to, the natural and essential principles of the human reason, there remain only pantheism or materialism, whose necessary, inexorable conclusion, immediate or mediate, is the negation of God, atheism. And atheism, by abolishing the absolute principle of the whole natural order, abolishes at the same time, rigorously, the absolute principle of the whole moral order; destroys the very foundation of all morality by denying a supreme legislator, and, with him, all laws obligatory on the conscience, and thus condemns mankind to *immoralism*. On the one hand, through the theoretic reason, there is no certitude of truth; on the other hand, through the practical reason, no rule of good; and hence, the direction of human life is abandoned to egotism—the individual life to the useful and the pleasing, and the social life to caprice and force. And then Mr. Mallock's question comes up spontaneously, inevitably: Is life worth living?"²

These words come with telling force from one who has felt his soul tremble on the edge of the precipice. To be a murderer, a robber, a debauchee, is to be comparatively decent alongside of the professor of a philosophy of *immoralism*. Many of those who deny Christian theism do not foresee the consequences of their negation, says Ausonio. "What matters it? The consequences of a negation, or of an affirmation, do not depend on the prevision, or on the want of prevision, of the one who utters the nega-

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 410.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 410-411.

tion or affirmation; but they depend on the intrinsic connection that, according to the nature of things and ideas, chains an antecedent to its consequences." And, in this case, the consequences will not tarry. "They have been publicly preached and propagated far and wide under the lying name of progress, or of reform of our institutions, domestic, scholastic, civil, political, social; reform and progress that, with divers ways and divers arts, have always the one effect, to eradicate from among the people not only every rootlet of Catholic and Christian faith, but also every religious thought and sentiment, and hence every principle of moral life and of social order. Let us repeat once more: Without a law that obligates the conscience absolutely, there can be neither duty nor right; and there can be no obligatory law without a prime and supreme divine, religious authority, that is to say, without God. Whoever then abhors these *inhuman* corollaries of the philosophy of negation, inhuman because they are destructive of that which constitutes the specific essence and the personal dignity of man, ought to feel himself led, yes forced, to doubt the truth and goodness of the theories that have generated them. As false and criminal consequences can be logically derived only from false and criminal principles, he should not hesitate to turn backward, to retrace the way of his speculations, to examine them again more accurately, more severely than ever, to give himself no rest until he has discovered why and where his speculations were false, and until he has so corrected his speculations that they shall have no affinity with these fatal corollaries."¹ The argument is direct, and one that appeals to all humane men. Why, in the name of science, commit yourself to the doctrine of *immoralism*, a plague spurned, shunned by all manly men as long as mankind has written its record on clay or metal, stone, parchment or rags? With the voice of experience Ausonio, again and again, qualifies un-Christian philosophy as "*immoralism*." To repeat his warnings, to repeat his regrets, to repeat his humble acknowledgement of past un wisdom, of past foolishness, of past unreason, would be to rewrite his book. It deserves to be rewritten—in English; but we may be certain it will not be translated. Such is not the fate of deserving books written in French, German or Italian. Is it true that even Catholics will not read serious works that appeal more to the intellect than to the senses?

While retracing his own steps and exposing the errors of Kant, Ausonio does not neglect the more modern schools of sophistry, for which the talented German thinker prepared the way. Ausonio laments the neglect of philosophy in Italy. The hotheads whom

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p 412.

he led or followed in youth dreamed of a philosophical revival as a consequence of political revolution. To-day, he says, we Italians have as much freedom of speech and of thought as some other people enjoy. And yet the only change in the philosophical position is a change of masters. Before 1848 Italian thought was the slave of France. Since 1859 it has been the slave of Germany and England. To-day the new "freemen" enjoy a mental servitude, speaking a foreign tongue and thinking with other men's heads.¹

And yet, neither Germany nor England has any reason to boast of its originality. French "positivism" has long controlled their fashionable schools of "philosophy," and controls them still under the no less artful name of "evolutionism," a name devised to hide from the uncritical the base materialism that it covers. Positivism is materialism, and nothing more. It teaches that "matter is the only reality; that the only forces and the only laws are those of matter; that all the phenomena of the inorganic and organic world, of animal and vegetable life, of the intellective and volitive conscience, are modes or states, actions or passions, effects or results, evolutions or transformations of matter."² The adepts of this school speak of the soul, of spirit, conscience, thought, intellect, will, but they mean by these words either cerebral lobes, *medulla oblongata*, grand "sympathicus" or ganglionic plexus. "A system which thus reduces the whole essence of man to that of the brute, and the whole essence of the brute to that of the plant, and the whole essence of the plant to a kind of mechanism of matter, may well murmur or protest, but it is, theoretically, pure and unadulterated materialism. And what will it be practically? Once more the answer is: *immoralism*."³ Because the absolute negation of a spiritual order means, inevitably, the absolute negation of a moral order. A morality that consists wholly in the vibrations of certain nerves, or in the contraction of certain muscles, may suit the taste and satisfy the minds of "positive" scientists, but mankind will let them take their own risk if they are pleased to practise it, and to enjoy the happiness of making beasts of their positive selves.

"I am not scientific, you say"! exclaims Ausonio. It is the duty of science to seek the truth, and, having found the truth, to teach it, affirm it, regardless of the consequences, whether they be good or ill? And is it no longer allowed one to value a principle by its consequences? Then all logicians from Aristotle down have been at fault. It is a fundamental law that falsehood cannot be legitimately deduced from truth; and therefore it is certain and evident

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 85.

² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 24-26.

that a principle cannot be true from which false conclusions are necessarily derived. You insist on applying logic to geometry and to physics. And will you deny it to philosophy? You will—because you must. And why so? Because you know that with an analysis, with an application, of your principles such a deluge of enormities will rush out on the world that all but those who have hopelessly lost their way, or who have rejected common sense and the moral sense, will quake with horror. The so-called theories now in vogue of a universal mechanical monism to which, by means of evolution, selection, association, heredity, all forces, laws, acts and facts are reduced—not of the vegetable and animal organism only, but also of human life and consciousness—end unquestionably in consequences that destroy, annihilate, humanity itself.¹ “The man who will first dare to apply your theoretical doctrines to his own life ought to be shut up in a madhouse; and a jail is the only fit place for him who will apply the tenets of your practical doctrine to another human being.” Reading Ausonio's words, one feels that he is both a philosopher and a man. It is a mistake to assume that all philosophers of the male sex can make the same high claim.

The philosophy of the immoral has been presented to the world under various guises. The very latest goes by the name of Darwinism. The name is new, Ausonio says, but the thing itself is as old as the hills. As the centuries trooped one after another, those famous laws of “the struggle for existence,” and of “natural selection,” used to be called, in the old-fashioned schools, by the simpler names of “the instinct of conservation” and of “perfection.” In other words, every living thing, and especially man, whether we consider the individual or the species, has a natural tendency to conserve its own life and to ameliorate its own condition as much as possible. But evolutionism has changed the application of the ancient formulas. According to the new theory, life in general, including human life, is a war in which the strong, the elect of nature, are selected to exterminate the weak. The natural state of humanity, the legitimate end of all its progress, the ideal of its perfection, would then be the savage state of Hobbes: *Bellum omnium in omnes*. Let us be logical! Ausonio suggests. “It is clear that after a first selection, by which the weaker should be exterminated, the stronger must needs begin and complete a second extermination of the less strong. After the second comes the third, and so on, until the human race has been exterminated, barring one, for a while. You call your application of this system to the individual and social life of man by a new, hybrid, name—

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 485–487.

² *Ibid.*, p. 487.

sociology, Messrs. Evolutionists? Take up an old dictionary and we shall quickly correct you. Anthropophagy—there you have it!¹ Ausonio has certainly not grown less critical, less logical, less philosophical, or less practical, with years. There are many men who have not lost their faith, but who, nevertheless, have talked, of late, altogether too much unpractical philosophy. And the end is not yet!

We might, without waste of time, listen to Ausonio Franchi, as he analyses Spencerism, phenomenism—all the later so-called scientific schools. His training, his natural habit of mind, have made his book a history of the philosophy of the nineteenth century; not a dry record of facts and opinions, but a fresh, lively criticism of principles and of their logical outcome.

Before dismissing the purely philosophical questions which Ausonio so ably discusses, we feel bound to present a practical argument which is no less worthy of consideration because it is just now unfashionable among professing Christians as well as among professing rationalists. The "science" of anthropophagy is everywhere inculcated in journals and books, written for the cultured, the less cultured, the ignorant; as well as in schools, colleges and universities. It is the science of bestiality and barbarism. Now, if he who teaches others to do evil is morally more culpable than he who does the evil, then it is not the actual beasts and barbarians that are the more guilty, but the journalists, the writers, the "scientists"—the platform orators—who are the pedagogues of crime. And the more guilty of all are the governments, legislators, ministers, that, instead of seeking to eradicate evil by means of a good education, try, legally or illegally, through violent or astute methods, through hypocritical or tyrannical methods, to destroy the Christian school, and to replace it from infancy upward by an "unsectarian" education—an education without God and without religion—in other words, an education without morality. "Sow materialism and atheism in the minds and hearts of the children," says Ausonio, after nigh forty years of experience as a teacher, "and you will bring forth a generation bound by no other law than 'the struggle for existence,' a generation of brutal instincts and appetites, whose successors will be savages. My words are not vain," adds Ausonio. "The danger is so imminent, so grave, that the men of good faith among the supporters of the recent policy are beginning to protest in fear, nay in terror. Anxiously they demand a remedy that will save society from ruin. The recipes are plentiful, but not one of them is worth the paper upon which it is written."²

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 505-506.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 510-511.

Ausonio has not only had the experience of a rationalist, but also the added experience of a radical, for certainly a follower of Mazzini could, if he wished, claim to be in the fore-front of radicalism in the early fifties. Ausonio assisted at the birth of New Italy. He has watched the young kingdom as it made its hasty growth. He knows the dreams of the past and the present realities. His testimony about past methods, about losses and gains, about the practical value of the changes in the political condition of Italy, and about the actual religious and social condition, is worthy the notice of historians, politicians, writers of all schools and in all countries.

The greater evils that afflicted us in the days that have gone, he writes, were the domination of the foreigner, political division, and what we called mental and moral servitude. Independence, liberty, unity—this was the formula by which we expressed our idea of national right. We organized revolutions, we made war; we were beaten, and we were victors. In a few years we effected what other nations have failed to effect after centuries of trial and suffering. Does this word "we" mean the Italian people? No. Excepting the Lombardo-Venetian rising against Austria, which was really a popular or national movement, in all the other acts and facts of the Italian revolution the people and the nation were merely the instruments or the victims of the *bourgeoisie*, a class that does not constitute the one-hundredth part of the population. The ambition of this class is to rule and to enjoy. It triumphed in the end. What are our gains? The despotic authority of the state was overturned. Instead we have so-called political and civil "liberalism," based on the radical ideas of the French revolution. The dogmatic authority of the Church was overturned; as a consequence we have, in the intellectual and moral order, *naturalism*. Materially, there has been great progress; spiritually, a great loss. It would not be difficult to show that the gain in independence, in unity and liberty, has been more apparent than real. By force Italy acquired material unity, but what is won by force must be maintained by force. And more noteworthy still, under an outward appearance of unity there is perhaps less of moral union than there was under the old territorial divisions. There is full and entire liberty, but it profits and benefits only the few who represent *legal* Italy. As for *real* Italy, that is to say, the greater part of the Italian people, they feel that they are very much less free, less their own masters, under the present liberty than under the past servitude.¹ This testimony, though it merely corroborates the experience of those who have lived in Italy, and of those who

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 47-49.

have carefully gone over the written record of events, has, however, an especial weight, coming, as it does, from a man who worked ardently in the cause of "independence, unity and liberty."

From every side we hear lamentations, Ausonio adds, about the *want of character* in the Italy of to-day; about the *diminution of the moral sense*; about the frightful increase of suicides and of crimes, of barracks and prisons, of brothels and mad-houses. Now all men who have eyes with which to see, and ears wherewith to hear, know well that these public lamentations do not exaggerate, if indeed they adequately state, the reality.¹ We can sympathize with Ausonio when he feelingly protests that it was not of a like social condition that he and his friends dreamed in '48, as we can fully appreciate the sad heart with which he penned the following sad words: "There is not one of those whom I knew (I am speaking of men who labored and suffered to serve their country, and not to make use of it) whose later years of life have not been cruelly embittered by the memory of deluded hopes. How many have I heard exclaim, half angrily, half plaintively: Who would ever have said, who could have imagined, that the acquirement of independence, of unity, of liberty, which we promised would bring all blessings on our beloved country, should, instead, have precipitated her into the abyss of all evil? converting liberty of thought into depravity of mind and heart; liberty of conscience into a satanic hatred of God; liberty of worship into a frenzied hatred of Catholicity, of Christianity, of all religious principle and sentiment; liberty of the press into a pestilential infection of the moral sense and of common sense; liberty of teaching into a complete license for every patented master or doctor to poison the minds of youth, of children, of the very babes, so that the school has become a herding place for the flock of Epicurus. Who could have imagined that political and civil liberty would be perverted into a conspiracy to desecrate birth and death, to profane matrimony, to divide the family, to debase justice, corrupt our customs, make a god out of the state, and a brute out of man? To-day, much more than in Dante's time, it may be said of Italy:

*"Non donna di provincie, uno bordello."*²

A current of electricity courses through the pen of this man of seventy. Do you not feel the glow, and see the sparks? The words burn, and they burn deep. Can we wonder, if, after his painful, shocking experience, Ausonio thought it well to "examine his con-

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 50.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

science"? Happy, indeed, are they, he exclaims, who have no fears for the part they played in this disastrous revolution! The redemption of Italy, for this he labored; the *corruption* of Italy, this it was that followed.¹ The yoke of a State science, and of a State religion, he wished to throw off; it was thrown off, smashed into little bits, and youth was free to initiate itself in the madness of materialism, the bestiality of atheism, the infamies of a literature of prostitutes. Instead of the happiness we promised others and ourselves, the people, the real people, suffer under such a load of evils, of woes, of miseries, of spiritual and temporal calamities, that a new proverb has come into vogue: "How much better off we were when things were worse than they are!"² We have some American clerics and laymen who are delighted with the present condition of Italy, and who would, if they could, keep things as "good" as they are. What a pity these simple men had not trained with Mazzini, in '48! However, when all the wrongheaded Americans turn the corner of the seventies, they may, after a careful re-examination of their wits, learn more of modern politics and modern philosophy.

Every page, indeed almost every sentence, of Ausonio's book is, we repeat, a reparation for false teaching and ill-doing. Another instance of his former aberration and of his present apology, and our readers will more fully appreciate the madness of his rationalism and the logic of his later practical reasoning. He maintained, in '52, that Catholicity in Italy was dead, or at least moribund, and that the Italian people were only Catholic in name. As a proof of the former fact, he cited the clergy as witnesses. They were everywhere pointing a trembling finger at the "wounds" of the Church. As a proof of the latter fact, he claimed that the war made on the Church in every part of Italy was a free expression of the national mind and conscience. As particular facts, he cited the Roman celebration, when the Papal government was overthrown, and the Piedmontese celebration, when the ecclesiastical courts were abolished. He prophesied that, at the first breath of a new revolution the Church in Italy would be reduced to the condition of a private society and of an obscure sect. He looked upon the Church and the Papacy, not as merely dead, but as putrefying. He denounced Catholicity as tyranny, and Catholics as slaves. He denounced the Church as a coward, fearing criticism and disdain-ing reason. He charged her with being powerless to carry out her mission unless by means of prisons and chains, tortures and the pyre.³

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 252.

² *Ibid.*, p. 241. *Come si stava meglio quando si stava peggio!*

³ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 191-267.

Ausonio was young, just turned thirty. He imagined he was saying new things. He had not read the "reformatory" literature of the past. His "*Voltaire*" was so fresh in his memory that, when he quoted the hackneyed stuff of the eighteenth century, he imagined he was speaking his own mind. In his book you may read all he said. But, if you prefer, you may turn to an American or an English magazine of to-day, or to a debate in the Belgian parliament, or to a French or German "scientific" pamphlet, or to the ingenuous article of some paid Italian agent in a New York journal, or to the vacant-minded, audacious humbug of the lecture hall.

"It was political passion, mixed with what I may call a philosophical passion, that led me to deny a past of which history attests the reality, and to prognosticate a future that history was so soon to prove to be the vainest of dreams, the most fabulous of Utopias." Thus speaks Ausonio to-day. He has learned the value of history as a guide among the mazes of sophistry—a guide too little valued by men long out of the thirties. Judging the facts of history, Ausonio gives some details that all men may lay to heart.

First, of the clergy and their complainings he remarks—and his remark is well worth attention—that the natural tone of the clergy may be said to be "elegiac." At the end of the last century, if we were to trust to their lamentations, Catholicity was extinguished, not only in France, but in Europe. Their sermons are not pitched in the same key though, because the gospel fills them with the idea of the progress and the triumph of the Cross. The priests are not contradictory. The Church, being a congregation of men, is made up of the good and the bad. There is, there always will be, reason for complaining; but this cannot prove that the Church is dead or dying. And how could the attack made on her by Italians prove her dead or dying? The war against her was not general, as the men of '48 claimed. It was confined to a small class, the political orators and writers.¹ As we very well know, these important men easily assume that they are the nation. Perhaps, if the unfashionable "I" could be rehabilitated, the world would have a better measure of the egotists who hide their assumption under the cover of the imposing "we."

Evidently the men of '48 were wrong in their prophecies. Had they been right there would not have been to-day a shadow, a memory, of the Church. But there she stands, dominant, more dominant than ever, in Europe and America. The popular celebrations at Rome and in Piedmont were not universal, as Ausonio made out; and there were few of those who took part in them

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 193.

who meant to abjure Catholicity. Some men thought that they could fairly make a distinction between spiritual and temporal, between dogma and discipline. Among Catholics there were divisions, due to the acceptance of false principles,—for there is no distinction possible that can free men from the duty of obedience to the Church,—but these divisions proved no more than that they existed.¹

To-day the Church is not free; on the contrary, she is subject to the State. The Church is no longer the dispenser of honors, favors, dignities, riches. The State has changed places with the Church. The revolution has been victorious, and yet the Church in Italy is not an obscure sect. Catholicity is to-day the religion of the Italian people, and the greatest moral power in the universe.

*Mentita est iniquitas sibi!*²

The Catholic is, evidently, not a slave; he is, indeed, the only freeman—unless prostitution be freedom and chastity be slavery. The apostolate of the Church has never been one of force. “I spoke falsely,” says Ausonio. “History and experience have taught me that the only apostolate of force is the apostolate of ‘reforming’ rationalism, whose results are a puerile credulity, an acceptance of quackery, a hatred of all religion, a mental, spiritual and social anarchy.”³

“To understand many of my words and acts in 1850,” Ausonio adds, “you must recall the circumstances. Then Italy was flooded with scandalous attacks on the Popes, on cardinals, bishops, priests and friars. The most infamous stories were told, with the minutest detail of time, place, circumstance, person. Sworn testimony of eye-witnesses, or of ear-witnesses, was plentiful. I believed these things. They suited my passion of the hour. Of such stuff are men made. These stories were perjured lies, atrocious calumnies, invented carefully by the hatred of the sects.”⁴

But the Church has stood it all. She is neither cowardly nor is she powerless. The Pope in the Vatican, the robbed and scattered monks, the priests pursued by special laws, are more powerful than they were before the revolution that was to eliminate the Church from modern society. She is the sole power that the revolution, with all its fury, fears—not disdains. She is the sole power that resists the revolution with a firmness so unshaken and a constancy so indomitable, that her apparent discomfitures ever end in victory. From the Church every material support has been withdrawn,—police, magistrates, the army; the Pope has been despoiled of his States, and has been

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 194.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 213–216.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 197–199.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

compelled to shut himself up, a prisoner, within the Vatican. And yet the life of the Church in Italy is not ephemeral or illusory. All the force, all the violence, of the new kingdom is not equal to the task of repressing her, or of weakening her; and, outside of Italy her life is so robust, so vigorous, that the most powerful State of our day, after years of a bitter warfare, and of a fierce persecution waged under the lying standard of civilization, has had to confess her superiority, to confess itself vanquished, and has been obliged to treat with the Papacy.¹

"I have in the past uttered some false prophecies," Ausonio truly exclaims. "I shall now make a true one. As no man has seen the Church reduced to the condition of a private society, or of an obscure sect, in the past, so no man will see it in the future." This prophecy is a simple historical induction, confirmed, and confirmed forever, by the gospel promise: *Portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam*.

The present office holders under the *legal* Italian government, the hired editors of the Crispi ministry, the "naturalists," who have selected the devil as their representative,—these men are not pleased with Ausonio. They have been profoundly impressed by his repatriation. His courage is undeniable, they say. The cool, experienced arguments of the man who was long ago pronounced "the greatest critic of our times" are more powerful in 1890 than were the passionate unreason of Gioberti or the vain assumptions of Rosmini in the forties, more powerful than the trickery of Cavour or the crazy audacity of Garibaldi in the fifties. Padre Bonavino was not the only priest that lost his head in '48. Vannucci, Ardigò, Frezza, Fiorentino, to name only a few, sacrificed Christ on the altar of the Revolution. The day of reckoning has come. The gods of the past have to answer for their proven criminality to living men. Ausonio's book is only a sign of the times. His experience has been a painful one. How it must have wrung his heart! Twenty-one years ago he knew how Italy had been cheated, politically, and, editing the letters of his friend Giuseppe La Farina, he spoke words that did not spare the present ruler of Italy, Crispi. La Farina, who, barely twenty-two, took part in the insurrection at Messina in 1837, gave his life to literature and to the cause of "Independence, Liberty, Unity." A friend and fellow-worker of Daniele Manin, founder of the *Società Nazionale*, intimate and confident of Cavour, to whom he introduced Garibaldi, La Farina was in the end driven out of Palermo by the Crispi party, because of his monarchical and annexationist views. Broken in heart, he died suddenly in 1863. And here is Crispi,

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 244.

the rabid minister of an "annexational" monarchy! What a day that will be when the dead rise unto judgment!

"Immoralism" can never establish itself in this world. The historical induction from Sodom and Gomorrah is striking enough to arrest an inductive mind as it calls up the story of the past, and especially of this nineteenth century. In Italy the men who honestly, if madly, fought for the destruction of "dogmatism and despotism" are recanting by the score—Mazzinians, Garibaldians. You may read of death-bed confessions, of religious funerals with the Masons left out, in journal after journal. The counter-revolution has come. Watch it, ye men who do not know the history of the "Reformation" or of the "Encyclopædists"!

Still, the soldiers who come back on bent knees to the truth of Catholicity are not feared or valued. They were only the tools of the tools of tools. Every one knows it now. But the recantation of "the greatest critic of our times" is to be feared. It reaches higher; it means much more. It means not merely that the Revolution has been tried and found wanting; it means further that godlessness has been tried and found wanting; that the high and the low have grasped the purpose of the men who cried out, Freedom! only that they might enslave thought, destroy the Christian Church, rob the poor and the self-sacrificing, and degrade men, in order still more completely and more easily to chain them to the wheels of despotic authority, crushing civil and religious society.

Of the courage of Ausonio Franchi little will be said by contemporary rationalists. One of them, Vittorio Bersezio, frankly commends it. But he adds, with the simplicity of the serpent: "he would have done better to nurse his remorse secretly." You lovers of liberty, light, sweetness and truth! What fine confessors you would make! A courageous man is a power—and Ausonio has now a courage of which you know nothing—the courage of faith. This is a force whose power is not to be measured by the intensest audacity of "immoralism."

To attack God and His Church is to commit a terrible crime against society. To repair the wrong, in as much as possible, is a dutiful and most meritorious act; an act that appeals to the deepest, kindest, tenderest sympathies of the Christian. Let us not patronize, however. Great Paul it was, Apostle and Philosopher, that spoke the words, not always remembered: "Let him that standeth beware lest he fall!"¹

¹ With more than ordinary pleasure we note that the publishers of Franchi's great work have announced a second and revised edition, at the popular price of 5 lire.

THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER
CONFESSION.

THE question whether the Westminster Confession should be revised has become a burning question to all Presbyterians; and the heated debates about it have attracted widespread attention among all professed believers in the Christian religion. It has been proposed to the several presbyteries which compose the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (North) of the United States in a way that demands a positive and definite answer.

The intense feeling and excitement which the questions propounded by the General Assembly have occasioned, if not caused, seem at first sight entirely inconsistent with what the Confession itself by necessary implication declares it is, or rather, is not; and inconsistent also with the origin of the Confession, the circumstances under which and the manner in which it was formed.

According to its own statements it is not an authoritative rule of faith or belief, for in a number of places it expressly declares that the Sacred Scriptures are the only rule of faith and life, worship and obedience.

In view of this it seems strange that such extreme importance should be attached to the question of revising or modifying it. For if it be true, as Presbyterians professedly believe, that the Sacred Scriptures are the "only rule of faith and practice," the "only rule to direct us how we may glorify God and enjoy Him forever," and if "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself," the simplest and seemingly the only proper course for Presbyterians to adopt, would be to take the Bible as their guide and not concern themselves about what the Westminster Confession or any other confession declares or does not declare. Nay, more, every statement of doctrine or of the meaning of the Scriptures on any subject whatever would, in this case, be insufferable arrogance, and ought to be resisted as an attempt to substitute fallible human opinions for the Scriptures themselves.

In view also of the origin of the Westminster Confession and the manner in which it came to take the form and character its framers gave it, it seems very strange that it should be regarded as a document of such supreme importance. The historical facts connected with its formulation are entirely opposed to its being looked upon as a religious "symbol," or as anything else than a book gotten up by bitter partisans engaged in a desperate struggle

against king Charles I., intent on acquiring political supremacy and imposing their opinions, both religious and political, upon the peoples of England, Scotland and Ireland.

It would be a wearisome task to undertake to unravel the tangled web of shifting events which led up to the formulating of this so-called Confession and state them in detail, or to trace the crooked path travelled by the persons now styled "the Westminster Divines," who were appointed by the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled to do the work which that parliament (now known as the "Long Parliament") ordered them to do.

These persons were named in the Act of Parliament dated June 12, 1643. In the same Act they were "required and enjoined, upon summons signed by the clerks of both houses of Parliament, and left at their respective dwellings, to meet and assemble at Westminster, in the chapel called King Henry the Seventh's Chapel, on the 1st of July, 1643, and after the first meeting, being at least of the number of forty, shall from time to time sit and be removed from place to place; and also that the said assembly be dissolved in such manner as by both houses of parliament shall be directed."

In the same Act it is prescribed that "The said assembly shall have power and authority, and are hereby enjoined, from time to time, during this present Parliament, or till further order be taken by both the said houses, to confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things concerning the liturgy, discipline and government of the Church of England, or the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false aspersions and misconstructions, as *shall be proposed* by either or both Houses of Parliament, and to deliver their advices or opinions touching the matters aforesaid, . . . to both or either Houses from time to time, in such manner as shall be required, and not to divulge the same by writing, printing or otherwise, without consent of Parliament."

They were each paid four shillings for every day's attendance. The Act of Assembly concludes with the following proviso:

"Provided, always, that this ordinance shall not give them, nor shall they in this Assembly assume or exercise any jurisdiction, power or authority, whatever, or any other power than is herein particularly expressed."

If any difference of opinion arose among the members of the assembly, they were to refer it to Parliament, with their reasons, that the two Houses might give further directions.

The persons named in the Act of Parliament were ten Lords, twenty Commoners, and one hundred and twenty "divines." Owing to the non-attendance, or rather refusal to attend, of a number of

the "divines" who were summoned, parliament summoned about twenty-one more "divines," so that in all there were, according to Hetherington,¹ in his history of the Westminster Assembly, "thirty-two lay assessors and one hundred and forty divines," including the Scotch Commissioners, six in number, two being laymen, four ministers. The Scotch commissioners represented the Parliament and Church of Scotland. These Scotch commissioners were appointed by the "Estates and General Assembly" of Scotland only after importunate, repeated entreaties of the "Long Parliament" soliciting aid and assistance in their doubtful and then seemingly desperate rebellion against King Charles I. of England, and their entreaties were only acceded to after the arrival in Scotland of a commission consisting of two Lords ("one of whom declined the journey"), four Commoners and two from the Westminster "Assembly of Divines." The Commissioners of the "Long Parliament" arrived on August 7th, and were received by a deputation of the Scotch General Assembly on the following day." They presented their commission giving them "ample powers to treat with the Scottish Convention and Assembly, a declaration of both houses, and a letter from the Westminster Assembly supplicating aid in their desperate condition,"² which letter was "so lamentable that it drew tears from many."

The Scotch "Convention and Assembly" quickly agreed that it was necessary to assist the English "Parliamentarians," but still there was "one difficult point" of difference between the Scotch and the English Parliamentarians which had first to be adjusted. The English Commissioners wished to enter into a political and military alliance with the Scotch, in order to bring Charles I. to terms, or to dethrone him. But the Scotch Convention and Assembly demanded a treaty which would bring the English Parliamentarians into conformity with the Scotch, as regards both religion and politics.

Accordingly, they insisted on a "League and Covenant for the

¹ Rev. W. M. Hetherington, author of the *History of the Church of Scotland and History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, is a classic authority with Presbyterians. In his preface to the last-mentioned work he says; "In common with all true Presbyterians, I have often regretted the want of a history of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, by whose labors were produced the Confession of Faith, the Directory of Public Worship, the Form of Church Government, and the Catechisms which have so long been held as the standards of the Presbyterian Church throughout the world. Especially in such a time as the present, when Presbyterian principles are not only called in question, but also misrepresented and condemned, such a want has become absolutely unendurable, unless Presbyterians are willing to permit their Church to perish under a load of unanswered, yet easily refuted, calumny."

² The "desperate condition" was the fact that at that time the Parliamentary party in England despaired of maintaining its stand against Charles I. without the assistance of the Scotch.

reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, according to the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed churches,"¹ and "to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity of worship in religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church Government, Directory for Worship and Catechising. . . . In like manner without respect of persons, to endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (that is, Church Government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness and whatever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of Godliness, and to endeavor the discovery of all such as have been or shall be incendiaries, malignants, or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the king from his people, or one of the kingdoms from each other, or making any faction or parties among the people contrary to this League and Covenant, that they may be brought to public trial and receive condign punishment as the degree of their offences shall require and deserve, or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, shall judge convenient."

Another section of the "League and Covenant," bound its subscribers as follows: "We shall, also, according to our places and callings, in this common cause of religion, liberty and peace of the kingdoms, assist and defend all those that enter into this League and Covenant in the maintaining and pursuing thereof, and shall not suffer ourselves, directly or indirectly, by whatsoever combination, persuasion or terror, to be divided and withdrawn from this blessed union and conjunction, whether to make defection to the contrary part, or to give ourselves to a detestable indifferency or neutrality in this cause, which so much concerneth the glory of God, the good of the kingdom and the honor of the king; but shall, all the days of our lives, zealously and constantly continue therein against all opposition and promote the same, according to our power, against all letts and impediments whatsoever; and what we are not able ourselves to suppress or overcome, we shall reveal and make known, that it may be timely prevented and removed; all which we shall do as in the sight of God."

¹ The term "best Reformed churches" referred especially to the Calvinistic "churches" of Geneva and Holland. The word "Reformed" is here used and will continue to be used throughout this paper (in accordance with the meaning commonly attached to it by Calvinistic Protestants) in contra-distinction to Lutheran. The "Reformed," or, as they were first styled, the "Sacramentarians," refused to accept the Lutheran doctrine of "*Consubstantiation*."

Another section declares: "We shall, with the same sincerity, reality and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavor . . . to preserve and defend the king's majesty, person and authority . . . that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminish his majesty's just power and greatness."

The concluding section is as follows: "And this covenant we make in the name of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed," etc.

We have quoted enough of this League and Covenant to give a fair idea of its purport and intention. King Charles I. issued a proclamation against it (as he had previously done against the Westminster Assembly), denouncing it as "in truth nothing else but a traitorous and seditious combination against us and the established religion of this country," and charging his loving subjects that they "presume not to take the said seditious covenant." It was subscribed to by the House of Commons of the Long Parliament and by members of the Westminster Assembly on September 25, 1643, and on the following 25th of October by the House of Lords. As soon as information of this was received in Scotland, the parliament of that kingdom ordered the Covenant to be "subscribed by all ranks and conditions of people," under penalty of confiscation of their estates, and such other punishment as the Parliament might resolve to inflict. In February of the following year, 1644, it was again ordered by the Long Parliament that the Covenant be taken throughout the kingdom of England by all persons over eighteen years of age, under grievous penalties for refusal. Even Englishmen in foreign countries were not exempted. Orders were sent to the Parliament's agent at The Hague to "tender it to the English in those countries, and to certify the names of such as refused."¹

We have dwelt at such length upon the League and Covenant because it was the forming of this compact or conspiracy, as readers may respectively term it,² that gave an entirely different direction

¹ See vol. i., p. 468 of the *History of the Puritans or Protestant Non-Conformists*. By Daniel Neal, M.A. Harper & Brothers: New York. 1844.

Rev. Daniel Neal was a Calvinist, a Dissenter or Independent, but well disposed towards the Presbyterians. He was the author of many treatises published in London during the first half of the 18th century, which were in high esteem among Protestants, and his *History of the Puritans* is regarded as a standard authority.

² We do not know how Presbyterians now regard the document. They very seldom refer to it. Some of them, doubtless, look upon it as simply detestable. Others, when confronted with it, would probably frame excuses or apologies for it on various grounds. Still others, though the fewest of all, would bravely defend it.

Neal, in his *History of the Puritans* makes no comments of his own upon it,

to the action of the Westminster Assembly and caused the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Directory for Public Worship, etc. (for they are all parts of a compact whole), to take the character and form that they received.

On the agreement of the English Commissioners in Scotland to the League and Covenant the Scotch Commissioners went to London, and thenceforth (owing to their representing the Scotch Assembly and Parliament) became an influential factor, if not the ruling power, in the Westminster Assembly.

We now return to that Assembly. Contrary to our first intention, we find we must say a few words more about it and its proceedings, for the discussion of the question of revision is plainly widening into a question whether the whole Westminster Confession shall not be disowned and abrogated.¹

As we have already said, the whole number of persons (lay, assessors and divines) summoned by the Long Parliament to meet at Westminster on July 1, 1643, was one hundred and seventy-two. Of this number only sixty-nine were present on the appointed day, and, generally, the attendance ranged from sixty to eighty. Not more than from a dozen to a score spoke frequently, the remainder being content to "listen and vote."² About twenty-five

but gives it in full, and also gives at length the objections of those who refused to sign it, and at equal length the answers to those objections by those who insisted on their signing it. Hetherington admires it and lauds it. He says: "It is difficult to conceive how any calm, unprejudiced, thoughtful and religious man can peruse the preceding very solemn document, without feeling upon his mind an overawing sense of its sublimity and sacredness."

Yet, looked at "calmly" and "thoughtfully," and without prejudice, how can any religious man regard it other than one of the most detestable documents that human craft, inspired by fanatical hate, has ever framed. It was an oathbound conspiracy against both the religious and the civil rights and liberties of every man in England, Ireland and Scotland, who differed in opinion or belief from the signers of the "League." In the name of liberty, it aimed to take away every vestige of liberty; in the names of religion and conscience, to destroy all freedom of conscience and to render impossible freedom of religious belief and practice. Professing loyalty to King Charles I., it aimed at depriving him of all power and authority, and making him a subservient slave, to do the bidding of the conspirators. The tyranny which Charles and his counsellors strove to maintain, was bad enough, but the tyranny which the framers of this "Covenant" sought to rivet alike upon the people of England, Scotland and Ireland, was tenfold worse. It was only partly enforced, never fully enforced, for the simple reason that it was too outrageous to permit of its being enforced. But, to the extent to which it was enforced, it was productive of immeasurable suffering and misery.

¹ One presbytery is reported to have already demanded the formation of a new and different Confession of Faith.

² Hetherington, page 93. The statements of Neal and other Protestant historians accord, on this point, with Hetherington's.

It must have been a wearisome task to sit and "listen." Bailie, of Glasgow, one of the Scotch commissioners, writes admiringly: "The like of that Assembly I never did see, and, as we hear say, the like was never in England, nor anywhere is like to be."

of the persons summoned were "moderate" Episcopalians, but the greater number of these refused to attend.¹ The few who did attend for a short time soon withdrew in disgust or because of King Charles's proclamation, condemning the Solemn League and Covenant. Dr. Featly alone continued to attend; but he, having been detected writing letters to Archbishop Ussher about the proceedings of the Assembly, was expelled and imprisoned.² The principal parties (members of which disagreed among themselves) in the Assembly (excluding the Episcopalians) were the Presbyterians, the Independents, or Congregationalists, and the Erasmians. These latter held to a theory which made the Church the mere creature of the State, and claimed that the punishment of all offences, whether civil or ecclesiastical, belonged exclusively to the civil magistrate. How these parties alternately combined and wrangled and contended, a few extracts from Neal and Hetherington in the subjoined note will tell.³

Still, there were some things he did not exactly like. "The Prolocutor," he says, "is very learned in the questions he has studied, but merely bookish; . . . so after the prayer he sits mute. It was the canny conveyance (cunning contrivance) of those who guide most matters for their own interest to plant such a man of purpose in the chair. . . . Their longsomeness is woful at this time, when their Church and kingdom lie under a most lamentable anarchy and confusion. They see the hurt of their length, but it cannot be helped," etc.

¹ Their objections (we condense from Neal) were that "the Assembly was prohibited by royal proclamation"; that the members were not elected by the clergy, and, therefore, could not represent them; that they "disliked the company and the business they were to transact"; "there was a mixture of laity with the clergy"; "the divines were, for the most part, of a Puritanical stamp, and enemies to the hierarchy; and their business was to pull down that which they (the Episcopalians) would uphold."

² These Episcopalians had been summoned for the purpose of endeavoring to conciliate, if possible, the "moderate" Episcopalians, and of withdrawing their support from Charles I.; the declared purpose of the Long Parliament at first being to amend the XXXIX. Articles of the "Church of England."

³ Neal says (vol. i., 489-91): "All who remained (after the Episcopalians left) were for taking down the main pillars of the hierarchy, before they had agreed what sort of a building to erect in its room. The majority at first intended only the reducing the episcopacy to the standard of the first or second age (of the Church), but for the sake of the Scots' alliance, they were prevailed to lay aside the name and function of bishops (subsequently the name was conjoined with that of "pastor"), and attempt the establishing of a Presbyterian form, which at length they advanced into *jus divinum*, or a divine institution derived expressly from Christ and His Apostles. This engaged them in so many controversies as prevented their laying the top stone of the building, so that it fell to pieces before it was perfected." Neal adds (page 494): "It was undoubtedly a capital mistake of Parliament to destroy one building before they agreed upon another. The order of worship and discipline of the Church of England was set aside twelve months before any other form was appointed."

Hetherington (page 116) says: "It may be expedient to give a view of the parties, by the condition of which it (the Assembly) was from the first composed, by whose jarring contentions its progress was retarded, and by whose divisions and mutual hostilities its labors were at length frustrated and prevented from obtaining their due result."

(These are the declarations, not of censorious critics, but of earnest defenders of the Westminster Assembly.)

We have written in vain if we have not made it clear (from evidence derived exclusively from defenders of the Westminster Assembly) that it was not a representative body in any sense. It had not even the shadow of pretended authority which an election by members of a sect, or of any number of sects, could give it. It was the mere creature of a parliament of factionists (at a time when there was another parliament in England—that of Oxford—supporting Charles) who had no bond of union among themselves except that of opposition to King Charles.¹

The sincerity, piety and learning of the members of the Westminster Assembly are now commonly extolled to the skies by Presbyterians and Protestants generally. They are frequently characterized as “saintly, venerable divines.” We shall pass no judgment upon them, but the statements of their own apologists and staunch defenders seem to imply that, to say the least, there is room to doubt their claims to such eulogiums. Certainly, they were differently regarded by not a few other Protestants of their own times, and especially by Episcopalians. We give a few of these adverse statements in the subjoined foot-note.²

¹ Hetherington admits this and tries to apologize for it: He points out (page 100) “one peculiarity in the Westminster Assembly. It was neither a convocation nor a Presbyterian synod, or General Assembly. . . . There was a Christian church, but unorganized. . . . Such an Assembly could only have been called by a Christian civil magistrate, and only in a transition state of the Church, when disorganized.”

² Neal (vol. i., p. 460), introducing a defence of the Westminster “divines,” says: “I believe no set of clergy, since the beginning of Christianity, have suffered so much as these.” In reply to this, Dr. Grey curtly says: “And no set of clergy ever deserved it more.” In support of his statement, he quotes Bishop Williams, of Ossory, as declaring: “You may judge of them by their compeers, Goodwin, Burroughs, Arrowsmith and the rest of their ignorant factions and schismatical ministers that, together with those intruding mechanics (who, without any calling from God or man, do step from their butcher’s board, or horse’s stable, into the preacher’s pulpit) are the fellows who blow up this fire that threatens the destruction of our land.”

Lord Clarendon says: “About twenty of them were reverend and worthy persons, but, as to the remainder, they were but pretenders to divinity; some were infamous in their lives and conversations, and most of them of very mean parts and learning, if not of scandalous ignorance, and of no other reputation than that of malice to the Church of England.”

These statements are made by opponents of the Assembly and, of course, must be received with allowance. But there are some facts which appear to strongly corroborate them.

Hetherington, whom we have already quoted as to this very point, admits that there “were only a dozen or a score who frequently spoke,” and that the rest “only listened and voted.” This statement is all the more significant, because diffidence and reticence were not distinguishing characteristics of the nonconformists of those times, to whatever sect or faction of a sect they adhered. Moreover, all historians, writing about the then existing condition of England, concur in declaring that men of most infamous characters and of not even the slightest pretensions to education, claimed to be called of God to preach the gospel, and assumed to be divines.

The elaborateness and fulness of statement¹ of the different documents put forth by the Westminster divines, as a declaration of belief, directory for public worship, plan of government, etc., are frequently brought forward as proofs of their learning and eminent ability. These certainly are elaborate and lengthy. But they had to be elaborate, owing to the numerous qualifications and disclaimers of consequences which they dared not acknowledge, but which, in some cases, were logically implied in their statements, and in other cases, if not implied, their opponents had accused them of. Moreover, the Westminster "divines" had abundant materials already elaborated to enable them, with little trouble, except that of selection, to extend their statements to any length.¹ They had at hand almost countless "confessions, consensus, apologies and catechisms" of the "best Reformed" or "Calvinistic" churches,² on the European continent, with which "churches" they were in constant correspondence, and particularly with those of Holland and Geneva. They also had the elaborate writings of Calvin and other Calvinistic "divines."

The Westminster "divines" met for the first time, as we have already said, according to the injunction of the Long Parliament, on Saturday, July 1, 1643. Having received "no specific instructions" from the parliament, as to the order of procedure, and having "no subject prepared for their immediate discussion, they adjourned till the following Thursday." When they met together on the Thursday mentioned, "instructions were laid before them, as general regulations, by the lords and commons in parliament assembled," on eight different points. "Having made these preliminary arrangements, the parliament sent to the Assembly an order to revise the Thirty-nine Articles for the purpose of simplifying, clearing and vindicating the doctrines therein contained."³

Accordingly, they went to work on the Thirty-nine Articles. But in the latter part of September, the Scotch Commissioners, as we have already narrated, appeared in the Westminster Assembly with the "Solemn League and Covenant," which the Assembly, submissive to parliament, accepted. This League and Covenant at once blocked the way to any further consideration of the Thirty-nine Articles. Thus, after spending several months over altering

¹ The *Westminster Confession* is certainly very lengthy. Including all its parts, it comprises in the copy before us, published in Philadelphia by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 528 pages.

² We have, before us, as we write, an 8vo. volume of nearly one thousand pages (presented to us many years ago, and published in Leipsic in 1840), a collection of the *principal* "Published Confessions of the Reformed Churches." With the exception of four or five, or perhaps five or six, they are practically now unknown and forgotten. But, at the time of the Westminster Assembly, they were well known.

³ Hetherington's *History of the Westminster Assembly*, pp. 103 and 104.

the first sixteen of those articles, their further consideration was forever dismissed. On October 12th the parliament required the Assembly "to take in hand the discipline and liturgy of the Church," that is, "the Directory for the Worship of God, and the Plan of Government and Discipline."¹

In obedience to the directions given them, the Westminster "divines" went to work on October 17, 1643, at their newly appointed task, continued to wrangle over it and debate until July 4, 1645, when they submitted their report on Church Government and Discipline to parliament. They commenced work on the Liturgy or Directory for Public Worship on May 24, 1644, and finished and submitted it to parliament on December 27th of the same year.

How entirely and exclusively the Presbyterian Directory for Public Worship and the Form of Church Government and Discipline had their origin in and derived their authority from Ordinances of the Long Parliament is well shown in a book² which by rare good fortune we discovered among the forgotten treasures of the Philadelphia Library.

The title of the first document in this book is: "A Directory for the Publique Worship of God Throughout the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, Together with an Ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and for the Establishing and Observing of this present Directory."³

¹ Dr. Briggs (and Hetherington and Neal and all historians agree with him): "It is clear that the Westminster Assembly (and the Long Parliament, whose obedient servant the Westminster Assembly was) was more concerned with the practical matters of church government and worship than with matters of doctrine."

Translated into plain English, this means that the Long Parliament and the Westminster "divines" were more concerned to construct the upper stories of their house than to lay a substantial foundation for it.

² It was printed in London, by order of the parliament, in the year 1646, and was "bequeathed in the year 1803 by the Rev. Samuel Preston (Rector of Chevening, in Kent, Great Britain) to the Library Company of Philadelphia."

³ The preface of the *Directory* is curious reading; it says: "In the beginning of the Blessed Reformation our pious ancestors took care to set forth an Order for the redress of many things which they then discovered to be Vain, Superstitious and Idolatrous in the Publique Worship of God. This occasioned many Good and Learned men to rejoice much in the *Book of Common Prayer* then set forth. . . . Honest, long and sad experience hath made it manifest that the *Leiturgie* (the *Book of Common Prayer*) used in the Church of England (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it) hath proved an offence not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the Reformed Churches abroad." Then follow sundry reasons: "Disquieting the consciences of many godly ministers and people" who "could not yield to the many unprofitable and burdensome ceremonies," nor to "the reading of Common Prayer, which was made no better than an Idol by many ignorant and superstitious people." Then, too, "Papists boasted that the Book was a compliance with them in a great part of their service, and so were not a little con-

After the Ordinance of Parliament enjoining the use of the Directory, minute directions are laid down for every act of public worship. In its appendix there is a declaration that "Festival days, vulgarly called holy days, having no warrant in the Word of God, are not to be continued." Also a declaration that "No place is capable of any holiness under pretence of whatsoever Dedication or Consecration, neither is subject to such pollution by superstition, formerly used and now laid aside, as may render it unlawful or inconvenient for Christians to meet together therein for the publique worship of God."

Following the "Directory," the book before us gives still another Ordinance of the Lords and Commons (enacted August 23, 1645) "For the more *effectual putting in execution* of the Directory for Publique Worship in Parish Churches and Chapels," etc.

To avoid further tedious recital of this notable book, we give the titles of its other contents in the subjoined foot-note.¹

firmed in their Superstition and Idolatry"; . . . that reading of forms and prayer tended to make the ministers lazy and ignorant, and that the *Book of Common Prayer* hath been (and ever would be if continued) a matter of endless strife and contention in the Church and a snare to many godly and faithful ministers." . . .

"Upon these and many like weighty considerations, not from any love to Novelty or intention to disparage our first Reformers, . . . but that we may at this time answer the gracious Providence of God, . . . and may satisfy our own Consciences and answer the expectation of other Reformed Churches (on the Continent), and, withal, give some publique testimony of our endeavors for Uniformity in Divine Worship, which we have promised in our *Solemn League and Covenant*, we have agreed upon this following *Directory* for all the parts of Publique Worship at Ordinary and Extraordinary times."

¹ The first of these consists of Directions of the Lords and Commons, August 19, 1645, . . . for the electing and choosing of Ruling Elders in all the Congregations and in the Classical Assemblies . . . for the speedy settling of the Presbyteriall Government. Next comes an Ordinance of the Lords and Commons (October 20, 1645) . . . Together with Rules and Directions concerning Suspension from the Lord's Supper in Cases of Ignorance and Scandall. Also the names of such ministers and others that are appointed Triers and Judges of the ability of the Elders, etc. Next comes (next in order of the book, but not of time, March 14, 1645) "an Ordinance of the Lords and Commons for keeping of Scandalous persons from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Enabling of Congregations for the choyce of Elders, and Supplying of Defects in former Ordinances and Directions of Parliament concerning Church Government,"

The Preamble to this Ordinance, among other things, recites that the Parliament, "by the merciful assistance of God, having removed the *Book of Common Prayer* . . . and established the *Directory* in the room thereof, and having abolished the Prelatical Hierarchy by Archbishops and Bishops and their Dependants, and instead thereof laid the foundation of a Presbyteriall Government in every Congregation, with Subordination to Classically, Provincial and National Assemblies," etc., therefore "Be it ordained," etc.

Next follows another "Ordinance of the Lords and Commons (June 5, 1646) . . . for the present settling, without further delay, of the Presbyteriall Government." Next follows an "Ordinance of the Lords and Commons (August 28, 1646) . . . for the Ordination of Ministers by the Classical Presbyters (Presbyteries) within their

This recital of unquestionable historical facts, we are fully aware, must be intolerably dry and tedious reading. Our apology for it is that the facts themselves in their order and relative significance are well nigh forgotten. They are only incidentally alluded to by the greater number of English historians, and when alluded to they are so overshadowed by narratives of military movements, diplomatic disputes and other matters of a purely secular character that they fail to attract attention. Our object was to relieve the history of the origin and of the work of the Westminster Assembly from this mass of irrelevant material and show its real relation to the Long Parliament, and the despotic authority which that parliament, in conjunction with that of Scotland, assumed to have and exercise over the consciences and religious belief and practice of the peoples of England, Scotland and Ireland. This, we think, is all the more important owing to the fact that the present contention of the Presbyterians among themselves is yet only commenced. It is certain to grow in intensity and in the number of subjects it embraces (involving soon the whole Westminster Confession); and certain also to extend to other Protestant sects. In another paragraph we dismiss this branch of our subject.

Obedient to the orders of parliament, the Westminster Assembly next took up the work of framing a declaration of doctrinal belief or confession of faith to be imposed on the peoples of the three kingdoms. After preliminary work in special committees the Westminster "divines" debated about it from July 7, 1645, until December 4th, when they sent their draft to parliament for approval. Meanwhile, in accordance with directions of parliament, they had also been at work on a catechism. The debate about this commenced on September 14, 1646, and continued on until January 4, 1647. Differences of opinion then led the Westminster "divines" to resolve to prepare two catechisms—a larger and a smaller. The debate on the larger catechism began April 15th and continued until October 15, 1647, when it was sent up to Parliament. The Scotch commissioners who had taken part in the framing of all these documents then left the Westminster Assembly. The debate on the shorter catechism began, in the Assembly, on October 21st, and continued until November 25, 1647, when that catechism was also sent to parliament for approval. Parliament then ordered the Assembly to prepare Scripture proof-texts for both catechisms, which work they commenced on November 30, 1647, and finished on April 12, 1648.¹

respective Bounds for the several Congregations," etc. Following this (and the last document in the book) are "Remedies for removing some Obstructions in Church Government" (April 22, 1647).

¹ Neal (vol. ii., p. 13) says: "The Parliament apprehended they had now estab-

Without any preliminary remarks, we now take up the chief points of the present form of the contention about the question of revising the Westminster Confession. They are of vital importance, forming, as many of the disputants themselves declare, the heart and soul of the confession. As succinctly stated by a prominent Presbyterian "divine," they are as follows:

"1. The decree of reprobation or 'foreordination of some men and angels to everlasting death.'—Westminster Confession, Chap. III., 3."

"2. Preterition or 'the passing by of the rest of mankind' by the saving grace of God.—Chap. III., 7."

"3. Damnation of the whole non-Christian world, including non-elect infants.—Chap. X., 3 and 4."

"4. The Pope of Rome is the Antichrist and the man of sin prophesied by Paul.—Chap. XXV., 3."

"5. The Papists are idolaters.—Chap. XXIV., 3."

We first take up the last two above-mentioned points, and in reverse order, because they have been least discussed, and the revisionists seem to believe that they can be most easily disposed of.¹ The revisionists propose to strike out the word "*other*" from section three, Chapter XXIV. This section, which is on "Marriage and Divorce," would then declare that "such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists or idolaters, or such as are notoriously wicked in their lives, or maintain damnable heresies."

This alteration would free the Confession from expressly classifying Catholics with "*other* idolaters." But the offensive accusation would still remain in what is plainly implied in other parts of the Confession.

Without referring to other instances, we specify sections two, four, six and seven of Chapter XXIX., on "The Lord's Supper," in which it is declared that "Christ is not offered up to His Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all, . . . so that the Papist sacrifice of the Mass, as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ's one and only sacrifice." "The worshiping the elements, the lifting them up or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving

lished the plan of the Presbyterian discipline, though it proved not to the satisfaction of any one party of Christians; so hard is it to make a good settlement when men dig up all at once the old foundations." He also quotes Bishop Kennet as "observing": "That the settling Presbytery was supported by the fear and love of the Scots' army, and that when they were gone home it was better managed by the English army, who were for Independence and a principle of toleration; but as things stood nobody was pleased."

¹ One of the most prominent of the revisionists, in a published letter giving an account of the debate in the Presbytery of New York, says: "The anti-Popery clauses were not really discussed and were hastily disposed of."

them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ." . . . "That doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason; overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, and hath been and *is* the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries." "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do not carnally and corporally receive Christ crucified, the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with or under the bread and wine."

If what is declared and implied in these quotations from the Westminster Confession were true, then, veritably, Catholics would be idolaters. Presbyterians, therefore, to be consistent, must either entirely change their declaration of belief respecting the Holy Eucharist, or else, contrary to the dictates of their common sense, and the firm convictions of most of them, must regard Catholics as idolaters. There is no escape from this alternative.

The next point (point 4, as enumerated above) of contention is the declaration, in the sixth section of Chapter XXV., that "The Pope of Rome . . . is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God."

The revisionists only ask that this horrible declaration be stricken out. But here, again, insurmountable obstacles oppose them, unless the Westminster Confession be totally changed as to what it says about the Church and Church Government. With evident reference to the Catholic Church, it speaks of churches having become "but synagogues of Satan," and then in the next section it declares: "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ, nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof."

Section first, of Chapter XXX., declares: "The Lord Jesus Christ, as head and king of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church-officers." In the next section of this chapter it is declared: "To these officers the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent and to open it unto the penitent." . . .

When these sections and chapters of the Westminster Confession of Faith come to be carefully and seriously considered by Presbyterians, the question will squarely confront them: If the Lord Jesus Christ . . . hath appointed a government in His Church,

in the hand of Church-officers (visible officers, human officers), and has armed them with such vast authority and power, how can it be "repugnant not to Scripture alone, but to common sense and reason," to believe that our Lord Jesus Christ has also appointed a visible head of His Church over all these officers, to be a visible centre of unity and authority? How can *this* be "repugnant to common sense and reason?" Or, where can any Scripture be cited that is "repugnant" to it? This question will peremptorily demand an answer, does demand it, from our Presbyterian friends, and they cannot escape from it.

Some of them, evidently, perceive this, though not in its full force and extent. It is really pitiable to see how they vainly strive to find an answer to it that will not compel them, for the sake of truth and consistency, to abandon not only Presbyterianism, but Protestantism, and become "Papists!"

Rev. Dr. Briggs, Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary, of New York (and he well might be Professor of Presbyterian Church History, for he has most diligently searched its original sources both in Great Britain and on the European Continent), in his very remarkable book, published last year and entitled "Whither? A Theological Question for the Times," wrestles with the difficulty. He says: "The papacy, as a hierarchial despotism claiming infallibility and usurping the throne of Jesus Christ, is the Antichrist of the Reformers. Whether it be the Antichrist of the Scriptures or not, it is the closest historical approximation to the Antichrist of prophecy that has yet appeared in the world. The papacy is anti-Christian, the great curse of the Christian Church."

In another paragraph, he declares: "Richard Baxter (of the times of the Westminster Assembly, whom Presbyterians and Puritans almost worship) well says: 'This cheating noise and name of *unity* hath been the great divider of the Christian world, and under pretence of suppressing heresy and schism, and bringing a blessed peace and harmony among Christians, the churches have been set all together by the ears, . . . and millions have been murdered, . . . and *hatred* and *confusion* is become the mark and temperament of those who have most loudly cried *Unity* and *Concord*, *Order* and *Peace*'" (the italics are Dr. Briggs's).

Yet, Dr. Briggs's book is intended to be a plea for *Christian union* on a basis so comprehensive as to include the Catholic Church, of which the Papacy is the recognized, essential, necessary, obeyed, revered, venerated centre, life and soul! And Dr. Briggs is an acknowledged representative of a numerous body of Presbyterian "divines" of the more "advanced liberal" school.

Then, too, in a paragraph immediately preceding our quotations

from his book, he says: "Protestant divines have always recognized that the Church of Rome was a true Church" (a true Church in which Antichrist reigned!). . . . "They unite with her in veneration of the noble army of martyrs—pious monks, bishops, archbishops and *popes* (the italics are ours)—who have adorned the history of the Western Church. These are our heritage as well as theirs."

Pious Popes! Christian Popes! who occupied the office of Antichrist, and "exalted" themselves "in the Church against Christ and all that is called God," yet "venerated" by Presbyterians, professed adherents of the Westminster Confession of Faith!

We now take up in their proper order the remaining three points of contention, as contained in the Westminster Confession:

1. The decree of reprobation or "fore-ordination of some men and angels to everlasting death."

2. Preterition, or "the passing-by of the rest of mankind," and "the fore-ordaining them to dishonor and wrath."

3. "Damnation of the whole non-Christian world, including non-elect infants."

Immediately in conjunction with these points, we place¹ the

¹ We do this, because the express purpose of the Westminster Assembly and of the ordinances both of the English and the Scotch Parliaments was to bring the "Churches" of those kingdoms into closest conformity to the "best Reformed Churches." In what high esteem this Synod of Dort was held by both Presbyterians and Independents (the forefathers of the Congregationalists) may be learned from a statement of Richard Baxter, who closely watched the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly and hugely admired its "divines," though, on some points, he differed. He says: "As far as I am able to judge, by the information of all history of that kind, and by any other evidences left us, the Christian world, since the days of the apostles, had never a synod of more excellent divines (taking one thing with another) than this synod and the Synod of Dort were."

Dr. Schaff, a prominent revisionist, of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, seems to be of this same opinion. In a letter to the *Independent* of February 27, 1890, giving an account of the discussion in the Presbytery of New York, he says: "No such important and lengthy debate has taken place on theological topics, since the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly, except in the Vatican Council."

He adds, for what purpose we know not, unless as proof of his impartiality as a historian: "At Dort the three Arminian delegates who were sent by the Provincial Synod of Utrecht, had to yield their seats to the orthodox members who had been elected by a minority. The president of the synod, John Bogerman, translated Beza's tract on the civil punishment of heretics into Dutch, and approved the principle of persecution, even the burning of Servetus. The victory of Calvinism was obscured by the deposition and exile of about two hundred Arminian clergymen, the imprisonment of Hugo Grotius and the execution of Van Olden Barneveld."

He also says: "The Westminster Assembly and Long Parliament were no more tolerant toward the Episcopalians, and deprived at least two thousand of them of their benefices."

How thoroughly the Synod of Dort represented "the best Reformed churches" may be inferred from the fact that Niemeyer says that "very many eminent theologians of the Reformed churches of Great Britain, Germany and France assisted" at

famous "five points" of the Synod of Dort (of highest renown among all the "Reformed churches") on the same subjects, as correctly summarized by Dr. Philip Schaff, of the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York. They are:

"1. Unconditional Predestination."

"2. Limited Atonement."

"3 and 4. Total Depravity, and Irresistible Grace."

"5. Perseverance of the Saints."

The explicit mention of the objectionable doctrines could be avoided by excising a few sentences or parts of sentences from the Confession. The elimination of only one line in section 3, chapter III., would remove all mention of the doctrine of the "foreordination of some men and angels to everlasting death." To escape from any explicit statement of the doctrine of "preterition" would require that section 3 (in the same chapter), consisting of seven lines, be stricken out. To get rid of all mention of the doctrine of the "damnation" of "non-elect infants" and of the whole non-Christian world would require that three and a half lines of section 3, Chapter X, and the last seven lines of section 4, of the same chapter, be expunged.

But to free the Confession of what the objectionable doctrines presuppose, or what grows out of them by necessary consequence, would require a reconstruction of many other parts of the Confession; indeed, a reconstruction of the whole Confession. Else, it would be as veritable a specimen of theological "crazy-quilt" patch-work as could possibly be put together.

The doctrines objected to by the revisionists are the central ideas of the whole book, including not only the formal statement of doctrine, but also the catechisms, "Plan of Government" and Directory for Public Worship. Excise from the Confession the objectionable doctrines, and you "cut out its very heart."¹

As an example, the statements implying the damnation of non-elect infants and of the whole non-Christian world are constituent parts of Chapter X. on "Effectual Calling," and this doctrine of "Effectual Calling" is inseparably connected with the two doctrines above stated, and with that of "preterition" or "reprobation."

What the term "effectual calling" means, can be inferred from

the deliberations. Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*, vol. i., p. 264, says: "That the Synod of Dort consisted of thirty-eight Dutch and Walloon divines, five professors of universities and twenty-one lay elders. . . . Besides these, there were twenty-eight foreign divines from Great Britain, the Palatinate, Hesse, Switzerland, Geneva, Bremen, Emden, Nassau and Wetteravia,"

Only twenty-four years intervened between the close of the Synod of Dort and the first meeting of the Westminster Assembly.

¹ Many of the anti-revisionists perceive this and base their arguments upon it, without attempting to defend the doctrines objected to by the revisionists.

a few quotations. In Chapter III., section 6, on "God's Eternal Decree," it is declared that "they who are elected . . . are effectually called." . . . Neither are any others "redeemed by Christ," etc., "or effectually called," . . . "but the elect only." In Chapter X., which we have already cited, section 1 declares: "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, He is pleased in His appointed and accepted time, effectually to call . . . by His almighty power determining them to that which is good and *effectually* drawing them to Jesus Christ." . . . In section 2 it is declared: "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is *altogether passive therein*."¹

The word "effectual" might possibly be explained were not the context entirely opposed to such an explanation, as meaning that the call becomes effectual through the obedience, by the help of divine grace, of the individual subject of the "call." But, as used in the Westminster Confession, the word effectual has reference solely to the immutable purpose of God, to "call effectually" and redeem in Christ the "elect" and the elect only; and they "by God's *almighty power* are *determined* to that which is good." As for the non-elect, they are not "effectually called," but only outwardly called, and are "*altogether passive*" thereto. "For them," says the Westminster Confession (Chapter III., section 7), "God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will . . . to pass by, and ordain them to dishonor and wrath." Plainly, therefore, the words "effectually called," as used in the Westminster Confession, mean *irresistibly* called. The "elect" must obey the call, and cannot do otherwise, for by God's "*almighty power* they are *determined* to that which is good."

What we have just stated is further proved by the idea of a limited atonement which runs through the whole Confession. According to it (not expressly stated but plainly insinuated), Christ did not come to save mankind, but the elect alone; did not atone for the sins of the world, but for those only of the elect. Not to mention other places where this is inculcated by implication, section 8 of Chapter VIII. speaks of "those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption. The answer to question 59 of the "Larger

¹ Lest, even in the slightest degree, we seem to be unfair in our quotations, we here give the clauses we omitted above: "Who (man) is *altogether passive* therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call." We do not think the following words, "until being renewed," etc., improve, in even the slightest degree, the statement. Man, "until he is renewed, is entirely *passive*"; and it is God's "almighty power" solely that "determines him." Here, it seems to us, "preterition" or "reprobation" of the "non-elect," in its most horrible form, is inculcated, not expressly, but by necessary implication.

Catechism" declares: "Redemption is certainly applied . . . to all those for whom Christ hath purchased it."¹

We have abstained from all attempts at theological discussion of the doctrinal points in dispute between the revisionists and the anti-revisionists. We make no pretensions to being a theologian. Moreover, our purpose simply is to turn attention to the origin and history of the Westminster Confession, show what it is, how it acquired the form and character it has, and then to point out how far-reaching are the real issues which are involved in the controversy. The disputed subjects include some of the most difficult questions human reason can grapple with, and some of the most profound mysteries that faith can apprehend.

The contention is now merely at its preliminary stage; simple in one form, complex in another; simple as to whether or not the Westminster Confession should be revised; complex as regards the subjects that should be included in the proposed revision. It is now certain that revision will be demanded by a very great majority of the Presbyteries of which the General Assembly is composed. The contention will, therefore, be transferred to that "Assembly," and will there have to be fought out on sharply defined issues. If attempted to be buried in committee or otherwise evaded or indefinitely postponed, the inevitable result will be, must be, interminable dissension, confusion and antagonism of irreconcilable beliefs, if not the creation of two new Presbyterian sects. No sentimental pleading about "respect for the bones of their forefathers" or "leaving the old flag untouched" will be listened to.²

How will our Presbyterian friends, as Presbyterians or as Protestants, meet and solve the momentous and inexpressibly solemn questions that confront them? For the revisionists to permit nothing to be done, or that only which would amount to nothing but evasion, would be to belie their own convictions. It is proposed by some, both of the revisionists and the anti-revisionists, to allow the Confession to remain unchanged, and to supplement it with a "short and simple creed," declaring "the love of God in Christ for all mankind." But then Presbyterians would have two opposing creeds, directly contradicting each other.

¹ See also ch. xvii., on "The Perseverance of the Saints" (the Elect). We cannot quote, owing to restricted space.

² Dr. Parkhurst (and unquestionably he expressed the feelings of many other Presbyterian ministers) is reported to have declared: "If I take a thorough view of the doctrines (of the *Westminster Confession*) I must say to my congregation, 'some of you are going to be damned, are damned, have been damned from the time you were born, were hated by God from the time of your conception.' Sooner than teach that I would tear my Geneva gown into shreds and the Bible into rags before another Sabbath, and my Elders and almost my whole congregation would sustain me."

The simplest solution, and the one consistent with express declarations of the Westminster Confession of Faith, would be to expunge every article and chapter except the first chapter; that on "The Holy Scripture," which declares that the Bible is the only "rule of faith and life," and that "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." But, evidently, the Westminster "divines" did not believe this, or else, under directions of the Long Parliament, they belied their own convictions. For, if they did believe it, why did they frame so lengthy and elaborate a "Confession" of "the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," and require from all their ministers and church officers an explicit declaration that they "sincerely received and adopted the Confession," etc.? And not only this, but strove to impose this lengthy and most elaborate Confession of Faith upon all the people of England, Scotland and Ireland.

Nor do either the revisionists or the anti-revisionists believe the declarations of the Westminster Confession which we have just quoted. Else why would the latter be contending that the "Confession" must not be altered, and the former that it must be? Both parties know full well that the moment the Sacred Scriptures are referred to, questions at once arise: "What do those sacred Scriptures teach and mean? What about God, about Christ, about the Holy Ghost, the effects of the fall of Adam and Eve, divine grace, the atonement of Christ, His Church, the Holy Sacraments, and other subjects we need not specify? And every authoritative answer to these questions forms part of a creed or "rule of faith."

Scripture! Both the opposing parties know perfectly well that the Westminster "divines" attempted to support every clause and sentence of their "Confession" with countless "proof-texts" from their Bible. Yet now the revisionists pay not the slightest attention to these "proof-texts," contending that they are not pertinent, or are misinterpreted; and as for the anti-revisionists, few of them attempt squarely to answer their opponents on this point.

In the Presbytery of New York (much the largest and by far the most influential of the Presbyteries that constitute the General assembly), the opposing parties, during twelve days of earnest, hot debate, bombarded each other with Scripture texts. And what did it amount to? Literally nothing. All the Scripture quoted by either party failed to have any effect upon the other.

The discussions of the contending parties are plainly tending, in the case of both, to a *reductio ad absurdum* of their position, and the more those discussions are prolonged, and the more earnest they become, the more plainly will this be shown.

There is but one way by which our Presbyterian friends can escape from their difficulties and find a solid, an immovable founda-

tion for faith; a foundation that cannot be shaken or moved; a foundation which is laid upon the unchangeable truth of God, who "neither can deceive nor be deceived." Would to God that they would open their eyes and choose that way. It is that of obedience to the infallible teaching of the ever-living One Holy Catholic Church; infallible not in virtue of human learning or wisdom, but by and owing to the ever-continuing "*divine assistance*" given to it in fulfilment of the promise of Christ, our Divine Lord and Blessed Redeemer, to be with it "*all days, even to the consummation of the world.*"

Scientific Chronicle.

SAFETY IN ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

THE enormous expansion, within the last few years, of the electric industry has multiplied the dangers to life and property arising from the reckless handling or careless distribution of powerful electric currents. Some would have us believe that there is no danger to be apprehended from the electric current. Such a position is untenable, in the face of facts. The chief clerk in the coroner's office, New York, can furnish a list of deaths by electricity, sufficient to convince any one that the current, as used in our cities, is constantly menacing the lives of our citizens. Others assume the rôle of injured innocents, and cry out there are more people killed by boiler explosions than by the electric current, and still you do not object to the use of steam. No, we do not object to the use of steam, but we do object to its misuse. Hence we have laws, according to which the boilers must be regularly tested, and by which the steam-pressure is limited. We do not object to electricity, but we object to the careless distribution of dangerous currents. Most of the sad accidents in New York can be traced to faulty construction, and hence to a cause which is removable. Moreover, it is certain that by the adoption of proper and known methods, all danger can be reduced to a minimum. Therefore, the public has a right to insist that the necessary conditions of safety be secured.

The electric currents, as used, are generated by dynamos. In these machines the current is produced according to the principles of magneto-electricity discovered by Faraday. Coils of wire are rotated between the poles of powerful electro-magnets, and momentary currents in alternate directions are induced in these coils as they approach

and recede from the poles of the magnets. In some machines these induced currents are immediately carried off to do the required work. These are called alternating-current machines. In others the alternating current is, by an ingenious device, twisted round upon itself in the machine, so that when the separate impulses leave the dynamo, they are all in the same direction. These are known as direct-current dynamos.

Both the direct and alternating currents may be either high or low-pressure currents. A low-pressure direct current is one not exceeding 200 volts, while the high-tension direct has a pressure of 2000 volts. The alternating current travels along the distributing mains at a pressure of from 1000 to 3000 volts and over. Of course, it does not enter buildings under this pressure, and here we have another difference between the two methods. In the direct-current system, the current generated at the central station passes through the lamps worked from that station, but in the alternating system the current from the central station does not enter private houses, or need not pass through the lamps worked by it. The fact that this high-pressure current can be employed without bringing it into the house depends on the use of transformers in which the high-pressure currents induce low-pressure currents, which are employed to do the house-lighting.

Almost all are familiar with an induction-coil, which consists of two distinct coils of wire, wound around a core of soft iron. One coil is of coarse, the other of fine wire. They are entirely separated from each other by insulating material. When a current of one or two volts' pressure, passing through the thicker wire forming the inner or primary coil, is automatically interrupted, a momentary current of 15 or 20 volts' pressure is easily induced in the outer or secondary coil at each make and break in the primary circuit. If the interruptions in the primary are very frequent, the induced currents follow each other with great rapidity, and seem continuous.

The transformer employed in the system of electric lighting by alternating currents is a similar instrument, but the current from the dynamo passes through the secondary or coil of fine wire, and induces currents in the primary or thick wire. The alternations in the current correspond to the interruptions in the preceding case, and the induced currents are of much lower pressure. These induced low-pressure currents from a coil entirely separated and well-insulated from the main current are used to run the lamps in buildings.

Are both the direct and alternating currents equally dangerous? This is a question frequently asked, and which cannot be answered without a distinction. If both are at a pressure not exceeding 100 volts, they cannot be regarded as dangerous to life, but at this pressure the danger of fire is considered greater with the direct than with the alternating current. Both currents at high pressure are dangerous to life, the alternating being more so than the direct.

Why, then, are high-pressure currents used? Would not low-pressure do as well? By using high pressure the energy can be transmitted to a greater distance. If water-power is to be utilized, it will be by employ-

ing great electrical pressures, so that the energy may be conveyed to distant points. By using high pressure fewer central stations are required, and by working a single large plant there is a saving in fuel, in copper for the conductors, and in other details connected with the running of several small plants instead of one large one.

If, then, from an economical point of view high-tension currents must be used, how are they to be carried? Can they, with safety to the public, be carried by overhead wires? With proper construction, safe distribution is not impossible. But in large cities, like New York, it is very improbable that the construction will ever be what safety demands. There are too many wires: there are telegraph, telephone, messenger-service, fire-alarm, electric-light, and others. These are owned by different companies, each one looking after its own wires, and caring little how they may interfere with neighboring wires. Then there are hundreds of useless wires, with no one to look after them. All these are bound to interfere with each other, and repeat the chapter of accidents already familiar. Of course, in open country, or in places not thickly populated, if overhead wires are properly erected, this danger does not exist. But, to insist on low-pressure currents is to increase the price of the electric light. It is certain, however, that overhead wires, carrying high-pressure currents, are dangerous.

The only remedy, then, is to place the wires in underground conduits. But here again there is another danger in the form of explosions, similar to those that occurred in New York. Gas leaks into the conduits and manholes, forms an explosive mixture with the air, the insulation is broken, an electric arc is formed and the explosive mixture is lighted, the pavement is torn up and stones and iron scattered in all directions, threatening the lives of those who happen to be passing by. Fortunately, no lives have been lost by these explosions, but there is a danger here that can be remedied by proper ventilation. In connection with this point, it is believed that these explosions would occur without a leak from the gas-mains. For the heating of an electric wire would bring about destructive distillation of the asphaltum or other substance used for insulation, and form an explosive mixture which would be ignited by an arc forming in the conduit. The remedy, however, is to be found in proper ventilation.

There has been much disputing with regard to the efficiency and durability of underground conductors. At the Electric Light Convention, held in Chicago a year ago, there was a very lively discussion on this point, the electric light companies claiming that no known insulation was sufficient in underground conduits; of course, it was expensive to them to put their wires underground. On the other hand, those interested in underground conduits and insulation claimed they were perfect; of course, they wanted to sell their wares. The discussion brought out a statement with regard to underground conductors which is of interest. Mr. Sunny, of Chicago, stated that an underground cable in use there had been giving satisfaction for a year, during which time it carried a current of from 2000 to 3000 volts. Their objection to it

was, that it cost one cent per lamp per hour more to run the lights than it would if aerial conductors were employed.

In Paris and Berlin all the wires are underground. In Milan there are underground cables giving satisfaction. In places, Mr. Werner Siemens's system of insulated conductors protected by lead cover, asphaltum and sheet-iron, has been in use, partly for high-pressure currents, for six years, and they are apparently good for years to come. When underground cables failed in the past and necessitated expense, it was due to want of knowledge or carelessness in construction.

No trouble has been experienced in Germany, from the fact that electric lighting is done by the direct low-pressure current of about 100 volts. In Belgium, although the wires are overhead, there is no danger, as they are low-pressure currents, and there is a careful code of laws regulating the construction of lines. From Paris we receive no shocking details of deaths from contact with the electric wires, for they are all carefully insulated and placed in the excellent sewer system of Paris.

From all this we gather that, by the use of well-constructed underground conduits, the danger of electric light wires can be entirely removed if low-pressure currents are used, and the dangers resulting from high pressure can be reduced to a minimum. We would not entirely rule out high-pressure currents, for they can be controlled, and there are circumstances in which economy demands their use. For example, to obtain cheap coal supply, a position on a water-front, or such as to utilize railroad facilities, must be selected, and the current conveyed by high pressure to distant points. Running expenses are reduced by massing machinery in one station; there is great saving in the conducting wires, and electricity is furnished to the consumer at a lower price.

These high-tension currents should never be run overhead in cities, and when carried into houses the tension should be low. This would necessitate the running of lower-tension currents by the direct system, and in the alternating system the transformers should be so placed that the main current will not enter the house, and they should be of such make and so well insulated that there would be no liability of a break and the main current jumping into the local circuit.

In addition to this, the law should see that all buildings where the current is used are provided with suitable safety-devices to automatically break the circuit should a current of too great pressure accidentally flow into the circuit. Telephone, telegraph and other circuits should be provided in a similar manner, to protect from any charge they might receive from the electric wires in the conduits. No danger whatever is to be apprehended from gas or water-pipes acting as conductors of dangerous currents from the underground wires into dwelling-houses. They will simply serve to divert at once such a current to the ground.

By proper legislation the wires can be put underground, the pressure regulated, and suitable safety-devices made compulsory, so that accidents will be unheard of, even with high-tension currents.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

It seems as if the fourth centenary of the discovery of America would see either the realization of the great discoverer's wish, a convenient route from Europe to the East Indies, or at least see work well advanced in that direction at Nicaragua, the most suitable spot for the inter-oceanic ship canal.

South of Mexico a great causeway, 1200 miles in length and varying in width from 300 to 28 miles, joins North and South America, and separates the Atlantic from the Pacific Ocean. The energy displayed to open up water-ways across this strip of land justifies Columbus in sailing westward in search of a convenient route to the far East.

Men long cherished the idea that nature had made the route, but finding that such was not the case, they set to work to devise one. Many plans have been made and many routes examined, but of all the schemes proposed but three attract any attention at the present time. They are the Panama and Nicaragua Canals and the Tehuantepec Ship-Railway.

Near the southern extremity of Central America, in the centre of Panama, the Chagres empties into the Caribbean Sea, and has its source well over to the Pacific near the city of Panama. In 1849 the Panama railroad, from Aspinwall to Panama, called attention to this spot as a suitable place for the inter-oceanic canal.

A canal at sea-level was by some of the best engineers deemed impracticable on account of the freshets in Chagres, but De Lesseps succeeded in raising \$420,000,000, which, together with interest and fixed charges amounting to millions of dollars, the Panama Canal Company now owes. Only about one-tenth of the actual work required to complete the sea-level canal has been accomplished. Seeing the enormous amount of work remaining to carry out the original idea, the plan was lately changed to a provisional lock canal. With this change in the programme, about 30 per cent. of the excavation necessary for a lock canal is finished. With the present embarrassed financial condition of the company, it is doubtful whether the work will ever be completed. At present there is a committee investigating the condition of affairs at Panama, with a view to deciding whether the work shall continue or not.

Tehuantepec, at the southern extremity of Mexico, was selected as a site for a canal. This would connect the Gulf of Mexico with the Pacific, and reduce the journey around Cape Horn by 9800 miles. A vessel sailing from San Francisco to the Gulf of Mexico around Cape Horn has to travel 16,112 miles. By crossing at Panama it would sail 5418 miles, while a canal at Tehuantepec would reduce the journey to 3561 miles.

After expensive surveys, it was found that a canal at Tehuantepec would have to be constructed over an elevation of between 700 and 800 feet above the sea, and would have to have near 200 locks; in other words, its construction was impracticable. At this point James B. Eads

proposed his ship-railroad across Tehuantepec. At the termini vessels are to be conducted into an especially prepared basin. This basin will open into a dry-dock, in the bottom of which there is a great car. As the vessel is raised out of the water it finds itself on this great car with many wheels, which is to carry it across the isthmus. By ingeniously-contrived mechanical appliances the vessel will be evenly supported and the load equally distributed over the whole car, so that the loaded vessel will not suffer any strain. The mass of engineering opinion regards the construction of a suitable road at this locality next to impossible, and the mass of nautical opinion regards the raising of ships out of the water and transporting them loaded overland to be detrimental in the highest degree to the vessels.

Engineers naturally turn their attention to Nicaragua. The route surveyed for this canal extends through the free state of Nicaragua from Greytown, on the Atlantic side, to Brito, on the Pacific. The distance is 169.67 miles. The location is admirably suited by nature for the opening of such a canal. Here the isthmus sinks to its lowest point; Lake Nicaragua, although but fifteen miles from the beach of the Pacific, still drains, by means of the San Juan river, into the Caribbean sea. The lake is deep and unobstructed, and the river, throughout most of its length, is navigable for light-draught steamers. So a water-way is already opened for most of the distance between Greytown and Brito. The amount of excavating to be done at Nicaragua is very small in comparison with what remains to be done at Panama, while but little labor is required to deepen the San Juan.

The class of work to be done, in order to complete the canal, may be gathered from some of the chief engineering features of the scheme. First of all, two harbors must be made, one at each terminus. At present vessels above six feet draught cannot enter the harbor of Greytown, but it is estimated that in three months, by dredging and protecting the channel thus made by a jetty of brush and pile, a temporary opening for vessels of fifteen feet draught could be made. Then, extending and strengthening the jetty by stone, and continuing the dredging, would make a permanent harbor of Greytown. At Brito the harbor would have to be protected by two breakwaters from the long swells of the Pacific. These two breakwaters, together with the excavation of the lowlands forming the banks at the mouth of the Rio Grande, would make the harbor.

The next feature would be the damming of the San Juan river, in order to raise and maintain the level of both the river and Lake Nicaragua at 110 feet above mean tide. Then, artificial basins would be made at different levels by means of dams and embankments and locks constructed to pass from one level to another.

At Panama there is the danger of a dry summit-level, which is in no way to be apprehended at Nicaragua, for here the water-supply comes from the lake, which is at the summit. For, say, thirty-two double locks about 130,000,000 cubic feet of water will be required; this is only about one-eighth of the supply of the lake.

A good idea of the nature of the work may be obtained by following the course of the canal, according to the latest surveys :

	Free Navigation.	Canal Excavation.
Greytown to Deseado Basin,		12.37
Deseado Basin,	4	
From Deseado Basin to San Francisco Basin,		3.07
San Francisco and Machado Basins,	11	1.73
San Juan River,	64	
Lake Nicaragua,	56.5	
Lake Nicaragua to Tola Basin,		8.22
Tola Basin,	5.28	
From Tola Basin to Brito,		3.5

Making, in all, 140.78 miles of free navigation, and 28.89 miles of canal excavation. This location, so admirably suited by nature for an inter-oceanic canal, is situated in an agreeable and healthy climate. It is, no doubt, to the interest of the United States to push forward the work at this favorable locality.

THE USE OF OIL IN STORMS.

IN a preceding number of the *CHRONICLE* we spoke of the work done by the Hydrographic Office of Philadelphia in collecting data respecting the use of oil, in experimenting and in spreading information among the masters of vessels, with regard to the use of this simple safeguard in time of storm.

As new facts are daily confirming the information we have, a word of explanation, with regard to the action of oil, will supplement what we gave on a previous occasion.

Many seem to think that, if you use oil, the waves cease. This is not the case. The larger waves are not quieted by the oil. The only way to destroy these is by a contrary wind. They may die out by fluid friction, and are often reduced by a heavy rain.

The oil actually prevents what is known as combing, also the formation of small waves and the growth of the crests of the large waves by the action of the wind.

Taking Franklin's as a partial explanation, and adding the explanation afforded by modern science, we have a very satisfactory solution for the action of oil.

On account of the large swells or waves started by variations in barometric pressure, the sea presents an uneven surface, which the wind breaks up into ripples. These ripples, by the continued action of the wind, become higher, broader and longer. But if, according to Frank-

lin, the water were covered with oil, the adhesion between the water and the oil is so very slight that the wind would move or slide the film of oil along without disturbing the surface of the water. Thus, in one way is the energy which would be applied to increasing the wave turned to account in pushing the oil over the surface of the water.

But properties of fluids, studied of late, reveal other causes at work to give oil its great efficacy in storms. The superficial film of liquids has a property called superficial viscosity. On account of this property, it is harder to break through the superficial film than through any other portion of the liquid. This outer skin of liquids also possesses surface-tension, in virtue of which the contained liquid is reduced to that form which gives the greatest cubical content the least superficial area. In virtue of the former property, the film will hold together; in virtue of the latter, it will easily break.

Now, pure water has great surface-tension, which is able to overcome its viscosity, and hence it is easily broken up into surf. But, if we cover the water with oil, the new surface has great viscosity or tenacity, but small tension, and hence is not easily broken up.

The wind strikes the sea in gusts; thus there is an unevenness of pressure on the surface which starts ripples that the wind lashes higher and higher. Now, if the surface were very viscous, the almost instantaneous force, due to a difference of pressure coming from a gust of wind, would have ceased to act before any perceptible movement could have taken place. This is precisely what the oil does; it resists by its viscosity any movement due to difference of pressure. Thus, the crests of the waves are not continually raised and sharpened until they are ready to break.

The vessel moves on, but the oil will not be carried on by the waves, as wave-motion is a transference of energy and not of matter. So, there will be a large oil-covered surface, through which the long, rolling waves, which the vessel can ride, will pass, but which, for the reasons given above, the wind cannot bring to the condition of a chopped sea. Moreover, the broken waves from around, entering this space and trying to raise it to the same state of excitement, will be spent by fluid friction.

A small quantity of oil is sufficient, for, in accordance with the laws of surface-tension, a drop of oil is rapidly drawn out over a large surface, and as the properties spoken of reside in the surface-film, this film acts as though the vessel were riding in a sea of oil. Animal and vegetable oils are preferable because more viscous. They do not, however, spread out so rapidly over the water.

Book Notices.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM: Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews. New York: The Christian Literature Company. 1890.

This volume, as we learn from the preface, closes the selections from the works of St. Chrysostom, and is the fourteenth and last of the "First Series of a Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church," edited by Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., "in connection with a number of Patristic Scholars of Europe and America."

We are sincerely glad that, of late years, the attention of Protestant scholars has turned to a study of the writings of the Fathers of the Church in the earlier ages of its history, and that they are publishing English translations of some of the writings of those Fathers. It is true that these translations are often misleading, and on very important points, not so much by unfaithful rendering of the text the translators adopt, as by their "revisions" of the accepted text, and by their glosses and notes, explaining away the real meaning of the Fathers. Yet, notwithstanding this, the expositions by the Fathers of the doctrines of the Church in their day are so lucid that persons who study them in these translations cannot fail to see that those doctrines are the same which the Church now teaches, and which, in great part, Protestantism denies.

The first series of this American edition of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers contains translations of the principal works of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom. It is greatly to be regretted that the series was not sufficiently extended to embrace at least some of the most important writings of St. Irenæus and St. Cyprian. It is true that, strictly speaking, they antedated the Nicene age; yet still, their relation to the Nicene age is so close and intimate, and their writings are of such classical authority, and shed so much light upon Christian doctrine and practice immediately before the time of the Nicene Fathers, that it seems strange that translations of their most important works should not have been included in the series. Reasons for the omission would easily suggest themselves were we to harbor the idea that the editor-in-chief and his assistant editors have been influenced by narrow sectarian motives, but the professed purpose of their labors and their high reputation forbid such an unworthy suspicion. It is to be hoped that, in volumes supplementary to this first series, they will remedy this serious deficiency by publishing translations of the most important treatises of the great Saints and Fathers whom we have mentioned.

The second series (the first volume of which will soon be published) of this "American Edition of the Christian Fathers," it is promised, will contain the most important works of the Latin and Greek Fathers from A.D. 325 to A.D. 800, in thirteen royal octavo volumes, of about 600 pages.

In the volume before us, the Homilies of St. Chrysostom on the Gospel according to St. John appear as in the Oxford "Library of the Fathers" (edited by the late Dr. Pusey), with a few additional notes by Dr. Schaff. The translation is from the Greek text "revised" (?) by Dr. Field. The Oxford translation of the Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews has been "thoroughly revised by the American Editor." An Introduction has been added on the authorship of the Epistle, "about which (the preface curtly says) Chrysostom was mistaken."

This introduction is a remarkable specimen of modern critical investigation. It is learned; it mentions various suppositions by ancient writers as to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It then, entirely ignoring the accepted testimony of tradition, judicially decides that St. Paul could not have written the Epistle to the Hebrews, because its style and line of argument are different from those of the other Epistles which St. Paul undeniably wrote. This categorical decision it tries to support by a laborious exhibit of the number of peculiar words employed by different Christian writers in the Apostolic age, and a careful computation of the ratio of the number of times these peculiar words occur, to a certain number of lines in the productions of these different writers. From this and other like laborious minute critical investigation, the conclusion is arrived at that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Barnabas.

The critical writer forgets (what entirely destroys the value of his argument) that of all the New Testament writers St. Paul was possessed of the greatest versatility, tact, and power of adapting his language and style and method of arguing to the time and circumstances and character of the persons whom he addressed. Emphatically he could be, and was, to the Jews, a Jew; to the Greeks, a Greek; to the Romans, a Roman—all things to all men, that he might win them to Christ.

But notwithstanding this, and attempted emendations of the text which, in many instances, are the reverse of emendations, and glosses and notes which explain away to some extent, the real meaning of the writers comprised in this "American Edition of Christian Fathers," we rejoice that the publishing of them in an English version has been commenced and hope that it will be continued. For though the defects we have alluded to detract from, they do not destroy, its value, and careful, earnest, single-minded readers will not fail to see and feel that the spiritual atmosphere in which those Fathers lived and moved, and their doctrinal status, were essentially the same as that of the Catholic Church of to-day.

ISABELLA OF CASTILE, 1492-1892. By *Eliza Allen Starr*. Chicago: C. V. Waite & Co. 1889.

History made easy, in the shape of "Outlines," "Sketches," "Lives" and "Selections," all popular at this period, is not always either reliable or pleasing. We are too ready to have our thinking, like the family washing, "done out of the house," and brought home to us in neat parcels. We too often accept the false conclusions of a narrow and inferior mind for the faithful rendering of the scholar's life-work. It is a good thing, therefore, when an elegant and conscientious worker undertakes to put the labors of honored authority into a form more inviting to the every-day reader. In other words, when Miss Starr sets Isabella of Castile vividly and beautifully before us as she has done in these pages, she makes no attempt to reproduce the history of Spain at that period; she simply gives us a picture of Isabella in words, and so easily and gracefully that it is not difficult to keep in mind her whole course from the cradle to the grave through a succession of marked events. Beginning with her birth among those Castilian mountains in that land of which she was as surely born "as of John the Second, its king, and Isabella of Portugal, its queen," she passes before us through her quiet childhood with her widowed mother at Arvela, through her blooming girlhood at the court of her brother Henry, the King, through her wise and magnanimous meeting and adjustment of the crisis which so nearly made her Queen during his life, through her romantic marriage, her succession to the throne, her steady and fearless rule, her generous, noble, womanly

life of fifty-four years, and her Christian death. A beautiful woman, a wise woman, a loving woman, and "every inch a queen." It is no small satisfaction to the women of America that of such a royal hand they received their birthright. "Uncrowned queens" as they have been called, there rests upon every brow the halo of Isabella's jewels, cast into the scale of the money-lender against that mythical sea pearl Columbus was yet to bring her from the far West, that fair new world of which she was the co-discoverer with him.

Bring prominently from the gathering mists of forgetfulness any hero or heroine of the past, either in fact or fiction, and there are always found those who are ready to couch lance in rest and ride, gallantly if fool-hardily, a tilt against them. Some cavilling and questioning has of course arisen as to the true Isabella. But Prescott long ago did her justice, and Miss Starr has caught the spirit of his splendid history with the simple and unadorned facts, for which he has proofs. Nor are Prescott and Miss Starr alone in their view of Isabella. Others of more or less note, of more than one race and more than one tongue, tell as fair a story, picture her as lovely, "point the moral and adorn the tale" of that same discovery. Within the limits of this notice more cannot be said, but it is to be hoped Miss Starr's admirable work may kindle the desire to know more of those days so weighted with interest for Americans. There are two years yet before we keep—in whatever style we may, the feast of our country's birth. Not a woman in the length and breadth of the land who has cause to bless its sunshine should be found unread in the history of her royal ancestress. From the greatest to the least, let her gather what she may of all stories, sift for herself, judge for herself. She will be well satisfied that Miss Starr's account is based upon wide foundations, builded of many hands, and she will be able to carry with her to the gathering of the Queen Isabella Association, into the presence of the Association's statute and the shelter of the Association's pavilion, many a fact, many a beautiful thought, many a noble aspiration, which will forever cluster around the memory of Isabella of Castile.

Miss Starr has clothed her thoughts as they deserve. The work is beautiful, and elegant paper, type and finish exquisite, especially the edition bound in white. There is a portrait of Isabella which looks like *a portrait*, not a fancy sketch. It is a very innocent and noble face that welcomes us in the frontispiece, with a dignity, simplicity and sweet gravity that becomes a Queen.

PALESTINE. By *Majör C. R. Conder, D.C.L., R.E.*, Leader of the Palestine Exploring Expedition. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

From the preface we learn that this book is one of a series of volumes, published under the general title of "Great Explorers." The purpose of the book is "to recite the story of Palestine Exploration," and especially "of the expeditions which Major Conder commanded"; to give "an account of the more important results of that work, and something also of the personal adventures of those employed."

These statements of the preface describe with sufficient clearness the plan and scope of the work. An introductory chapter gives an interesting account of the literature of Palestine exploration, going back to the time of Constantine. This chapter is enriched with an outline map of Palestine and part of Syria, according to Ptolemy; a section of Peutinger's table, representing a Roman map of Palestine about 393 A.D.; a map of Marino Sanuto, 1321; and a map of the Holy Land from the Atlas of Ortelius, 1591.

The body of the work contains, in successive chapters, accounts of surveys and explorations in Judea, "Researches" in Samaria, Galilee, Moab, Gilead, and Northern Syria. Following these are a chapter on the results of the exploration, several appendices, a list of "Old Testament sites" that were identified, "a physical map of Palestine," showing the elevations of the land and the depths of the adjacent sea, a geological map, and maps respectively showing Palestine "as divided among the Twelve Tribes," Palestine as it was "in the beginning of the Christian era," "the kingdom of Jerusalem, showing the fiefs about 1187 A.D., and "modern Palestine, showing the Turkish Provinces."

The chapters giving accounts of the explorations of the Surveying Expedition appear to us to be chiefly, if not only, interesting in their narratives of personal adventures, or their topographical and geographical statements and references; and these latter seem to us to be wanting in some instances in definiteness. The chapter on "The Results of Exploration" is interesting as showing the relation of the geology and physical geography of Palestine to its ancient fertility, and the evidence they furnish that the wells and cisterns, the snow of Hermon, the barrenness of the desert, the Bitter Sea, the sheep and goats, and foxes and coney; the corn and wine and oil of the Holy Land were just what they are described to have been when the Old Testament books were written. The Rose of Sharon has not withered, nor the royal purple faded in which the Iris clothes itself. All the imagery of the Canticle of Canticles is still to be found in Palestine, and also countless verifications of the accuracy and pertinency of the allusions in the New Testament writings to Palestine at that time.

The work is interesting on these accounts, but what seriously detracts from its value is that the author attaches very little, indeed, as it seems to us, no value to ancient tradition. A line of levels; a table of physical elevations and depressions; the distances down to the bed-rock underlying Jerusalem, or some other such topographical data seem to be sufficient reason for attaching no importance to Christian or Jewish or Syriac tradition. Because sundry shafts sunk and tunnels driven furnish data, as the explorers believe, as to the direction, etc., of the walls of Jerusalem, they have summarily decided from these data that the places venerated by Christians are *within* the ancient walls, and, therefore, are not the places where our Divine Lord was crucified, where He was buried and rose from his rock-sealed tomb. Lieutenant Conder is of the same opinion. This disposition, covert rather than open, to undervalue Christian tradition mars the whole volume.

LIFE OF DOM BOSCO, FOUNDER OF THE SALESIAN SOCIETY. Translated from the French of *J. M. Villefranche*. By *Lady Martin*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates,

This is a charming work; difficult to lay down when once taken up, until it is read through to the end. But this is not its greatest element of value. It is a book which we wish were in the hands of every layman and priest and bishop of the Church. The practical lessons it contains are invaluable. We do not here refer to the general lessons of confidence in God, and that He will open the way and provide means for sustaining every good and charitable work, commenced in right spirit and with good motives and continued in the same spirit and with the same motives; though these lessons are time and again forcibly suggested in the book. What we have in mind is the practical lessons, as regards manner and methods and spirit—particularly the spirit—in which charitable works should be conducted.

We refer thus particularly to the *spirit* in which charitable works should be carried on because we have long thought and have become more and more confirmed in the belief that there is too much of routine and "red-tape," too much of cold, rigid, unvarying adhesion to rule in the spirit and manner in which many most highly commendable charitable movements are carried on. This, we think, seriously mars and cripples the efficiency of these movements, and very often contradicts, if it does not defeat, the intention of the originators or founders of special charitable institutions or societies.

We are well aware that law, order, system, rules, are necessary to the success of every work of charity that is or can be instituted. Without them they cannot live or do their intended work. Yet, still, unvarying routine, rigid adherence to their letter maims and cripples, and if persisted in, kills them.

Instances of this, and of how certain charitable movements which have become cold and barren are present to our mind and will readily suggest themselves to the minds of others. It would be invidious to mention them.

The Life of Dom Bosco, and the continuance of his life in the Salesian Society of which, under God, he was the founder, contains another invaluable lesson to all, whether laymen, priests, or bishops. It is the fruitfulness, the *Catholicity* of the Church, in originating and adapting methods of carrying on work of charity, at once old and yet ever new, to suit, to meet and supply the ever continuing wants and needs of poor suffering humanity, amid all the changes of human society.

The saintly Dom Bosco was not a personage of times long past and gone; not a holy, devout, self-sacrificing man, whose name and works are preserved from oblivion in chronicles of the Middle Ages, or those that preceded them. He belongs to the nineteenth century, and to the present, latter part of the nineteenth century. He lived, too, and labored, and his labors were signally blessed of God in this age of skepticism and of contention; and in Italy, where the seeds of rebellion against and hatred of the authority of the Church had already sprouted and grown, and were rapidly bringing forth their satanic fruit.

CARDINAL LAVIGERIE AND THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE. Edited by *Richard F. Clarke, S. J.* London: Longmans, Green & Co. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company.

This book is more than its title implies; or, rather, its title is misleading, implying that its subject is the relation of the African primate to the slave trade on the Dark Continent; whereas it is, in reality, divided into two parts, the first giving a biography of the Cardinal, and the second an account of the African slave trade. Both parts form a narrative of most absorbing and thrilling interest, the former telling of a life of energetic and fruitful activity almost unequalled in these later ages of the Church, and the latter of barbarities most inhuman, and that form the darkest stain on the boasted civilization of our age, which seems to be more absorbed in commercial aggrandizement than in the relieving of human suffering.

Father Clarke has performed a noble work, and done it well, though many will think that he has, to some extent, spoiled it by a little characteristic English boasting in the preface. "England," he says, "has for a century or more taken her place in the forefront of the anti-slavery crusade. She has long since abolished slavery in all countries under her sway,"—yes, in name only, but not in fact. "She has rejoiced over

its abolition in the United States of America,"—when human respect compelled her to do so, and after she had sympathized and almost openly sided with the slave power in this country while there was yet hope of its success. In recent times she has often gone to war with savage or barbarous nations, but has it not been for the protection of British commercial interests, and not in the interest of human freedom? We think, therefore, that the pro-English tone of Father Clarke's preface is out of place, especially as there was no occasion for alluding to England at all, Cardinal Lavigerie's great mission being in a position to be tested by its own merits. And the work, as regards him and his labors, is deserving of unstinted praise. After reading this book, one easily concludes that he is such an apostle as "has long been needed for the uprooting of the traffic which degrades and depopulates Africa, and inflicts on her children revolting cruelties and sufferings that call out to heaven for vengeance"; "one whom we may hope that God has chosen for the apostolate." The book before us is "perhaps the best evidence of what are the aims of Cardinal Lavigerie and the spirit that has actuated his life. His noble self-devotion is . . . the growth of a lifetime spent in the service of God and of his fellow-men. In his episcopate in France he was the apostle of his diocese. In Algeria he was the apostle of the Arabs, and that under circumstances which rendered his apostolate a most difficult one. At the present moment he is the apostle of the slaves of Africa." Of this apostolate any summary of Father Clarke's book could give but a faint representation. It must be read in full to obtain an adequate idea of his labors and of the unspeakable heinousness of the traffic in human beings which he is so earnestly, and we hope successfully, striving to make a thing of the past.

LES ORIGINES DE LA REVOLUTION FRANÇAISE AU COMMENCEMENT DU SEIZIÈME SIÈCLE. LA VEILLE DE LA REFORME. Par *R. de Maulde-la-Clavière*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1889.

M. de Maulde is not the first writer who has tried to trace the origin of the French Revolution to the events of the "Reformation" time; but yet he opens up some new ground and adopts a theory that all his readers will not be willing to accept, namely, that had the upturning of Germany's religious affairs, especially with regard to the holding and acquiring of landed property by the Church, been imitated in France, there would subsequently have been no such disturbing of both Church and State as was seen at the close of the eighteenth century. In other words, he holds that the alliance of Church and State effected in France in the early part of the sixteenth century was destined to be fatal to both. It would hardly have been so had each party entered into the contract and remained in it on equal terms. But, unfortunately, as the civil power in France developed into the absolutism of the Bourbons, the Church came to be only the servant of the State, and not its equal. It was the Gallicanism that grew to full maturity in the reign of Louis XIV., that compromised the Church as well as the State when the great crash came. Too much royal power was the cause of the change in France, as too little had been in Germany. The comparison, therefore, which our author draws between the two countries is faulty, at least in this respect; and the conditions which in the sixteenth century prevented the story of the latter country from being repeated in the former, would, had they remained unchanged, have had the same effect later on. And had Germany, in the latter half of the fifteenth century, been unified as France was, it is more than probable that Martin Luther would have cut

a very small figure indeed in the history of his country. This is the conclusion one naturally draws from the reading of Janssen's first volume; and we are surprised that M. de Maulde overlooks it, particularly as he evinces considerable familiarity with the German professor's work, whose plan, indeed, he imitates to some extent.

But yet, M. de Maulde has made a very valuable contribution to the literature of history, in the picture which in this first volume he draws of the condition of France at the close of the Middle Ages. He shows that materially the country was then prosperous and the burdens of feudalism not so heavily felt as the average historiaster would have us believe. He is at fault, however, in the account he gives of religious life; it is not complete or satisfactory, dwelling too long on the so-called abuses, and not long enough on the influence of genuine faith and practice. His conclusions, however, are morally and politically sound; and it would be much better if the France of to-day would adopt them and act upon them. We await the next instalment of this work with both curiosity and historic interest.

PROBLEMS OF GREATER BRITAIN. By *The Right Hon. Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Bart.* Author of "Greater Britain," "The Present Position of British Politics, Etc." With maps. Macmillan & Co. London and New York: 1890.

This is a work well worthy of thoughtful perusal by intelligent Americans. By "Greater Britain" the author means all the dominions of the British Empire, excluding England, Scotland and Ireland. In an 8vo. volume of upwards of seven hundred pages he separately describes and discusses the material resources and the political, industrial, educational, moral and religious status and prospects of each of the British possessions, and also their respective means of defence in case of war. The chapters on the British dominions in North America contain also careful studies of their relations to the United States, and comparisons of their present and prospective prosperity and progress, their political organization, the partisan divisions of their population on lines of race, religion, and political ideas.

The subjects of Labor, Protection of Native Industries, Education, Religion, Liquor Laws, and the Future Relations of the Mother Country and the Remainder of the Empire, are very fully and carefully discussed, and also in the final chapter, the subject of Imperial Defence.

The work is not, in any sense, a series of theoretical speculations. It embodies the results of discriminating observation and careful study of the British possessions during two different visits—in 1866-67 during a journey round the globe, and again in 1875; and also of a laborious examination of official documents, and of conferences with distinguished officials and other well-informed persons in the countries that were visited. The intelligent reader, therefore, though he may not agree with the author's ideas on various subjects, will find in the book a very large amount of interesting and valuable information.

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF EVOLUTION. By *James McCosh, D.D., LL D., Litt. D.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

THE WORKS AND DAYS OF MOSES; or, A Critical Dissertation on the First two Chapters of Genesis. By *Sir William Perring, Bart.* London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

We notice these two books together because, though they may seem to treat of different subjects, their contents are really cognate, so much so that the substance of the latter is dealt with at some length in the

former. And they are both notable, if not entirely satisfactory, efforts in the line of Christian apologetics. We note it as a strange oversight that not a Catholic authority is cited in either work, notwithstanding the indisputable fact that Catholics are among the foremost writers on both Scriptural and scientific subjects.

Can it be possible that the Ex-President of Princeton College has given his attention to evolution these thirty years back, and has never heard of Prof. St. George Mivart, England's greatest propounder of the modified theory of evolution, that is in perfect harmony with Christian teaching? or that the names of Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Molloy, and many others are unknown to Sir William Perring? Yet so one would be led to infer from glancing over the pages of both; but it is strange and worthy of note that the conclusions both arrive at are those of the leading Catholic writers. Rev. Dr. McCosh briefly surveys the whole field of the evolution controversy, and indicates in what sense we may receive and advocate the theory of development in both the animal and the vegetable worlds. After stating the question he narrates the organic history, defines the powers modifying evolution, and points out the beneficence in its method. Then he discusses final cause in evolution, the mutual relations of geology and scripture, and finally the age of man. The English writer named above discusses in a long introduction the general question of creation as recorded in the book of Genesis, and in separate chapters has apt observations on Moses's law of writing, the first and second chapters of Genesis in particular, and he then, after a statement of some difficulties, examines the various theories as to the meaning of the days of Moses. In his final chapter he states his conclusions in a Christian sense.

INSTITUTIONES LOGICALES SECUNDUM PRINCIPIA S. THOMÆ AQUINATIS; ad Usum Scholasticum. Accommodavit *Joannes Pesch, S.J.* Pars II. Logica Major, Volumen 2, continens Logicam Realem et Conclusionem Polemicam. Friburgi Brisgovie; Sumptibus Herder. 1890. St. Louis: The same House.

We have already noticed the first and second volumes of this masterly exposition of the principles and practice of logic, based on the scholastic principles of St. Thomas, the first volume treating exhaustively of the precepts of logic, and the second of critical and formal logic. This third volume is the second and concluding part of the second volume, and it contains real logic and an appendix of controversy, covering the whole subject, in which are concisely sketched the chief systems of false philosophy that have been in vogue in recent times. The treatise on "Real Logic," which fills about three-fourths of the large volume, is subdivided into three dissertations, the first dealing with Transcendental Logic, or the conception of being in general; the second with Predicamental Logic, or the conception of categorical being; and the third with Post-predicamental logic, or the relations of beings to one another. Each dissertation is subdivided into sections, and these again into chapters and paragraphs, all arranged with a view to the facilitating of the student's work in acquiring knowledge. The various false systems discussed in the Appendix are the secularism of Bacon, the empiricism of Hobbes, Locke, Condillac, Hume, Comte and Mill, the exaggerated intellectualism of Descartes, Spinoza's dogmatism of pure speculation, the scholastico-mathematical method of Leibnitz and Wolff, Berkeley's idealism, the constructive method of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Schopenhauer, Cousin's eclecticism, Gratry's ontologism, De Bonald's traditionalism, and the transcendental realism of Herbart and Trendelenburg. A copious index fittingly terminates the work.

SOUVENIR VOLUME. Illustrated. Three Great Events in the History of the Catholic Church in the United States: (1) Centenary Celebration; (2) Proceedings of the First American Catholic Congress; (3) Dedication of the Catholic University. William H. Hughes, publisher: Detroit, Mich.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS, held at Baltimore, November 11 and 12, 1889. William H. Hughes, publisher: Detroit.

The first of these works is a royal 4to. volume gotten up in commendable style, as respects the illustrations, letter-press and general typographical make-up.

The illustrations, including therein portraits of His holiness Leo XIII., Pius VI., Archbishop Carroll, Cardinal Gibbons and all or nearly all the archbishops and bishops of the Church in the United States and also portraits of a number of distinguished Catholic laymen, are of themselves more than worth the price of the volume.

The letter-press contains the sermons, and the speeches and papers delivered or read at the Centenary Celebration, at the Catholic Congress, and at the Dedication of the Catholic University.

The second of the works above mentioned contains the official report of the proceedings of the Catholic Congress, with an introduction by William J. Onahan, of Chicago. It is published with the *imprimatur* of the Right Rev. John Foley, Bishop of Detroit. Its contents are the same as those of that part of the first-mentioned work which gives an account of the Catholic Congress.

DIARY OF THE PARNELL COMMISSION. Revised from "The Daily News." By *John Macdonald, M. A.* London: T. Fisher Unwin. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company.

The day has not yet come to write the history of the vilest political conspiracy of modern times, and the most unsuccessful, too, for it has injured only the party concocting it; but when it does come, this account of Mr. Macdonald's will be of considerable assistance to the historian, full as it is and on the whole fair and honest. In a long preface he tells of the events leading to the appointment of the Commission, showing coincidences strengthening the suspicion that the Government was a party to the slanders of the London *Times*, which invariably were published just in time to help in the enactment of coercion laws. Full, if not complete, reports are given of the proceedings from day to day, with all their exciting and amusing incidents; from the first meeting on October 22d, 1888, to the last on November 22d, 1889, the one hundred and twenty-eighth day. Though the real interest ends with the breakdown, flight and death of Pigott, yet the proceedings subsequent to this tragic climax—or anti-climax if you will—are an essential part of the history, as is also the Parliamentary Blue-book containing the report of the Commission Judges, which has appeared since Mr. Macdonald's work, and which is hardly less injurious to the enemies of Ireland than was the proving of the forgery of the letters attributed to Mr. Parnell. A copious index enhances the value of the work before us.

CORRECTIONS.—Two errors marked in the proof of Mr. Marshall's article escaped notice until too late for revision. One occurs on page 268, eleventh line from top, which should read, "The second General Council," etc., and not "The fifth," etc.; and the other, merely and obviously typographical, on page 281, twelfth line from top, where, instead of "Narianzen," it should be "Nazianzen."

